Ex dono Auctoris.

Mr Lucas Bean

MISCELLANIES OF DIVINITIE

Divided into three books,

Wherein is explained at large the estate of the Soul in her origination, separation, particular judgement, and conduct to eternall blisse or torment.

BY EDVVARD KELLET
Doctour in Divinitie, and one of the Canons of the Cathedrall Church of Exon.

S. Augustr. serm. nov. ad de S. Paulo.

¶ *Omnibus hominibus natis constituit Deus mortem, per quam de isto seculo emigrent. Exceptus eris à morte, si exceptus fueris à genere humano.— Jam homo es, venisti: Quomodo hinc exeas, cogita.*



¶ Printed by the Printers to the *University* of CAMBRIDGE, *Ann. Dom.* 1633.

MISCELLANIES
OF
DIVINITIE,
Divided into three books,

Wherein is explained at large the estate of the Soul
in her origination, separation, particular judge-
ment, and condign to eternall
bliffe or torment.

BY EDWARD KELLET
Doctour in Divinitie, and one of
the Canons of the Cathedrall
Church of Exon.

S. Augustin. Serm. 169. ad S. Paulo.

¶ Omnibus hominibus mutis confitetur Deus suum rem, per quam de
ipso fiendo cognoscunt. Excepta vita à mortis, & excepta Morte
à gente humana.—— Jam homo es, erubesce: Quamdiu hinc
curas, cogita.

¶ Printed by the Printers to the University of
CAMBRIDGE. Anno Dom. 1633.

TO THE MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD, MY VERY GOOD LORD, WILLIAM,

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY his Grace, Primate of all ENGLAND, and Metropolitane, and Chancelour of the University of OXFORD.

Most Reverend,

THE manifold graces which God hath plentifully poured on you, enabling you, even from your youth, to be a fit instrument divers wayes to advance his glorie, and blessing your great good labours with the favourable acceptance of our dread Soveraigne & State and all who have well-wishing unto this our Sion, have called me, a crazie, old, retired man, who never saw you but once, and

and that long since, to leave behinde me a testimoniall to the world, both of my heartie thanks to God, that you have been; & of my humblest prayers, that you may long continue (sitting in that Sea wherein God and the King have now placed you) a prop of our Church, a favoured Ezra, the prompt Scribe in the Law; a powerfull Aaron, to make an atonement for the people; an Elijah, zealous in your calling; a provident guide to the Prophets, to the Sonnes & Schools of the Prophets; a father, chariot, and horsemen of Israel, as Elisha called Elijah; & as king Joash called Elisha. May heavenly influences & divine irradiations say, Amen, Amen.

Your Graces in all duties,

Edward Kellet.

The Contents of the first book.

CHAPTER. I.

Sect. 1. *THe subject of the whole work. The reason why I chose the text of* Hebr. 9. 27. *to discourse upon. The Division of it.* Fol. 1. &c.

2. *Amphibologie prejudiciall to truth. Death appointed by God, yet for Adams fault. The tree of life kept from Adam, not by phantasticall Hob-goblins, but by true Angels, and a flaming sword brandishing it self. Leviticall ceremonies dead, buried, deadly. Things redeemed dispensed with, yet still appointed.* 2

3. *The Kingdome of Death reigning over all. Bodily death here meant, and onely once to be undergone.* 4

4. Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο *implieth not necessarily the longinquitie of future times intercurrent, but rather a demonstration that other things were precedent.* Τὸ After *doth often signifie an immediate succession. Judgement here taken for an act of justice.* 5

5. *The generall judgement here understood by Oecumenius and Bellarmine. The second book of Esdras apocryphall, and justly refused. More then the generall judgement is meant. Even the particular judgement also is avouched by many authorities. Three questions arising from the former part of these words.* 6

CHAP. II.

1. *HOw God is immortall, how Angels and the soules of men, how Adams bodie was mortall, and yet immortall, though compounded of contraries.* 10

2. *Aristotles last words, his death. Holcot, or the Philosophers pray for him. Aristotle canonized by his followers. Plato and Aristotle compared. Vives taxed. Adams bodie was not framed of the earth, or dust of Paradise.* 12

3. *Adam should not have been subject to any externall force, he was lord of the creatures: inward distemper he could not have. Adams bodily temperature. Christs, who was fairer then the children of Adam: the helps for Adams bodie, meat, drink, and sleep* 17

4. *Divers opinions of the tree of life. If Adam had eaten of the tree of life before or after his fall he had lived for ever. If he had not sinned, he had not died, though he had not tasted of the tree of life.*

To what use the tree of life should have served. 20

5. The Councel of Millan: Cardinall Cajetan, Richeomus the Jesuit, Julianus Pomerius and Saint Augustine think that Adam could not have died, if he had not sinned. The book of Wisedome, Holcot, Doctour Estius, and two passages of Scripture Canonicall, are authorities evincing that Adam had in the state of innocencie an immortall bodie. 24

CHAP. III.

1. DEath is a bitter-sweet. Enoch and Elias Raptures were not painfull to them. Christs transfiguration and the manner of it. That it was not painfull to him. Adams translation to a life celestiall and a bodie spirituall, should not have been painfull, if he had not sinned. They who shall be changed at Christs coming, shall by it finde no pain. Death is painfull. 28

2. Man-kinde died the first minute of their sinne. God draweth good out of evil. Death in some regard is changed from a punishment to be a favour and blessing of God. 31

3. Not many or more sinnes, but one caused death. One onely. David begotten in lawfull wedlock. That this one sinne is not lesse in the godly, nor greater in the wicked. Death was appointed for one sinne onely, of one person onely. 33

4. This one person onely was man: this man that sinned that one sinne was Adam. Strange and curious speculations, that Eve sinned not that sinne for which mankinde was appointed to death. 36

5. Two School-speculations propounded. The second handled at large, as expounding the former; and determined against the School-men themselves, viz. That the children of innocent Adam had been born confirm'd in grace. The censure of Vives upon these and the like points. A part of his censure censured. 43

CHAP. IIII.

1. ADams perfection in innocencie. Our imperfection after his fall, contrary to his, both in understanding and will, and in the parts concupiscible and irascible. 55

2. Adam had other laws given him: but one above all, and one onely concerning posteritie. 57

3. What this law was. Adam knew the danger to himself and his offspring. The first sinne was against this law. 58

4. Eve sinned before. How she sinned the same, and not the same sinne with Adam. 60

5. Zeno, the Stoicks, and Jovinian confuted. Sinnes are not equally sinfull. 62

6. Adam sinned farre more and worse then Eve. 65

7. This sinne of Adam was not uxoriousnesse, as Scotus maintained; but disobedience or pride. The branches of Adams sinne. 66

The Contents.

CHAP. V.

1. Originall sinne is an obscure point. The errours of the Schoolmen concerning it. The ever-sight of Bellarmine. 73
2. Originall sinne described by its causes: Distinguished from Adams actuall sinne. 77
3. In what sense Adam had, and his posteritie hath Originall sinne. We were in Adam. He stood for us idealiter. Every one of us would have done exactly as Adam did. We did sinne in Adam, and how. 78
4. Whether Christ was in Adam, and how. 82
5. We sinned not that sinne in Adam, by imitation onely. 84
6. Adams sinne, as personall, was not imputed. Adam is saved. Adams actuall sinne, as it was ideall, and representative, is imputed to us. 85

CHAP. VI.

1. Originall sinne is propagated unto us. Originall sinne properly is not in the flesh before the union with the soul. 90
2. Bishop Bilson, Mollerus, Kemnitius, and Luther, in an errour. Bishop Bilsons arguments answered. Conception taken strictly by Physicians, &c. We are not conceived in originall sinne, if we respect this conception. Conception taken largely by Divines. Thus we were conceived in sinne. 92
3. A Physicall Tractate of conception clearing the point. 97
4. A Discourse touching aborsives and abortives. Balthasar Bambach answered. The Hebrew vowels not written at first when the consonants were. Never any wrote till God had written the Two Tables. 98
5. The manner how the soul contracteth originall sinne pointed at. Bodily things may work upon the soul. 103
6. Righteous men have unrighteous children. The contagion of originall sinne is quickly spread. 106
7. No sinne or sinnes of any of our parents immediate or mediate do hurt the souls of their children, but onely one, and that the first sinne of Adam. 109

CHAP. VII.

1. A Review of the last point. Zanchius not against it. Bucer and Martyr are but faint, and rather negative then positive. 112
2. Bucer and Martyr make the state of the question to be voluble, not fixt and setled. Their objections answered. The place of Exodus 20. 5. examined. 113
3. S. Augustine appealed unto, and defended. 116
4. God justly may, and doth punish with any temporall punishment, any children like or unlike unto their parents, for their parents personall sinnes. 118

5. God doth, and may justly punish some children eternally, and all temporally for originall sinne, whether they be like their parents in actuall aversion, yea or no. 121
6. God justly punisheth, even eternally, wicked children, if they resemble wicked parents. ibid.
7. God oftentimes punisheth one sinne with another. ibid.
8. The personall holinesse of the parent, never conveyed grace or salvation to the sonne. ibid.
9. God never punished eternally the reall iniquities of the fathers upon their children, if the children were holy. ibid.
10. No personall sinnes can be communicated. The point handled at large against the errour of Bucer and Martyr. 123
11. The arguments or authorities for my opinion. The new Writers not to be overvalued. Zanchius himself is against Bucer and Martyr. 133

CHAP. VIII.

1. ORiginall sinne came not by the law of Moses, but was before it in the world. 138
2. God hath good reason and justice to punish us for our originall sinne in Adam. Gods actions defended by the like actions of men. 139
3. Husbands represent their wives. The men of Israel represented the women. Concerning the first-born of men and beasts. The primogeniture and redemption of the first-born. 140
4. The whole bodie is punished for the murder committed by one hand. Corporations represent whole cities and towns, and Parliaments the bodie of the Realm. Their acts binde the whole Kingdome. Battelling champions and duellists ingage posteritie. 144
5. S. Peter represented the Apostles. The Apostles represent sometimes the Bishops, sometimes the whole Clergie. The Ministers of the Convocation represent the whole Church of England. The authoritie of Generall Councels. Nationall Synods must be obeyed. 147
6. Private spirits censured. Interpretation of Scripture not promiscuously permitted. An Anabaptisticall woman displayed. 149
7. Another woman reproved for her new-fangled book in print. Scriptures not to be expounded by anagrams in Hebrew, much lesse in English; but with reverence. How farre the people are to beleeve their Pastours. 152
8. Saul represented an entire armie. Joshua and the Princes binde the Kingdome of Israel for long time after. 183
9. Christ represented us. Christ and Adam like in some things, in others unlike. Christ did and doth more good for us then Adam did harm. 184

THE

The Contents of the second book.

CHAPTER I.

Sect. 1. THe question propounded, and explained. Fol. 1.
2. Armenius, or rather his sonne Zoroaster, dead, and revived. ibid.
3. Antillus dead, and living again, because the messenger of death mistook him, in stead of Nicandas: Nicandas died in his stead. 2
4. A careless Christian died, and recovered life: lived an Anchorite twelve yeares: died religiously. ibid.

CHAP. II.

1. A Division of such as have been raised. They all died. 3
2. The widow of Zarephath her sonne raised, yet died again: supposed to be Jonas the Prophet. The Shunammites sonne raised, not to an eternall, but to a temporary resurrection. A good, and a better resurrection. 4
3. Christ the first who rose, not to die again. 5
4. The man raised in the sepulchre of Elisha, arose not to immortalitie. ibid.

CHAP. III.

1. WHilest Christ lived, none raised any dead save himself onely. 6
2. The rulers daughter raised by Christ, died again. ibid.
3. So did the young man whom Christ recalled to life. 7
4. Many miracles in that miracle of Lazarus his resurrection. ibid.
5. Christ gave perfect health to those whom he healed or raised. 8
6. Lazarus his holy life, and his second death. 9

CHAP. IIII.

1. TAbitha died again. 9
2. So did Eutychus. 10
3. They who were raised about the Passion of Christ, died not again, as many ancient and late Writers do imagine. Mr. Montague is more reserved. ibid.

The Contents.

CHAP. V.

1. *WHo were supposed to be the Saints which were raised, by such as maintain that they accompanied Christ into heaven.* 12
2. *A strange storie out of the Gospel of the Nazarens.* ibid.
3. *Adams soul was saved. Adams bodie was raised about Christs Passion, saith Pineda out of diverse Fathers: Thus farre Pineda hath truth by him. That the sepulchre of Adam was on mount Calvarie: so say Athanasius, Origen, Cyprian, Ambrose, Basil, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Euthymius, Anastasius Sinaita, Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople.* ibid.
4. *It was applauded in the Church in Hieromes time.* 13
5. *Theophylact thought Adam buried in Calvarie. Drusius unadvisedly taxeth the Fathers. Tertullian consenteth with other Fathers, and Nonnus, who is defended against Heinsius.* 14
6. *At Jerusalem they now shew the place where Adams head was found. Moses Barcepha saith, that Sem after the floud buried the head of Adam.* 17
7. *The Romane storie of Tolus, and Capitolium, much resembling the storie of Adam.* ibid.

CHAP. VI.

1. *HIerom saith, Adam was not buried on mount Calvarie. Both Hierom, Adrichomius, and Zimenes say, he was buried in Hebron. Hierom censured, for doubling in this point, by Bellarmine.* 19
2. *Hieroms arguments answered.* 20
3. *The Originall defended against Hierom in Josh.* 14. 15. ADAM *there is not a proper name, but an appellative.* Arba *is there is a proper name of a man. Adrichomius erreth in* Kiriath-Arbee; *and the words signifie not* Civitas quatuor virorum, The citie of foure men. *New expositions of* Kiriath-Arbee. ibid.
4. *It may signifie as well* Civitas quatuor rerum, The citie of foure things: *as,* Quatuor hominum, Of foure men. *The memorable monuments about Hebron.* 22
5. *It may be interpreted* Civitas quadrata, quadrilatera, quadrimembris, quadricollis; A citie foure-square, of foure sides, of foure parts, of foure hills. 23
6. *If* Kiriath-Arba *doth signifie the citie of foure men, yet they might be other men, besides the foure Patriachs.* 24
7. *If it had its denomination from foure Patriarchs, and from their buriall there, yet Adam is none of them.* 25
8. *Augustine peremptorie for Adams buriall in Calvarie; and Paula and Eustochium, or rather Hierom.* 26
9. *Another objection answered. The Jews never shewed extraordi-*

nary

nary honour to Adam, or Noah; but to Abraham, and others after him. Drusius preferreth the reading used by our late translation, Hos. 6. 7. *before the Genevane and Tremellian.* 27

CHAP. VII.

1. THough *Adam was buried in Calvarie, as Pineda saith; yet his proofs are weak, that Adam was raised with Christ, and went bodily into heaven with him. The cited place of Athanasius proveth onely Adams buriall there. Origen, in the place cited, is against Pineda. Augustine is palpably falsified.* 29
2. *Adams skull shewed lately at Jerusalem.* 30
3. *Dionysius Carthusianus saith, Eve then arose. His opinion is without proof.* ibid.
4. *Nor Abraham then arose.* ibid.
5. *Nor Isaac then arose, whatsoever Pineda affirmeth.* 31

CHAP. VIII.

1. PIneda *his phansie, that Jacob then was raised.* 33
2. *The reason, why the Patriarchs desired the translation of their bones, was not, to rise with Christ, as Pineda opineth; but upon other grounds, and to other ends.* ibid.
3. *Where Joseph was first buried, where secondly.* 34
4. *The great difficultie of Act. 7. 16. propounded. Two answers disliked. The originall is not corrupt.* 35
5. *Beza taxed for imputing corruption to the originall, on* Mat. 13. 35. *and on* Luk. 22. 20. *and on* Matth. 27. 9. *All these places defended, and the sacred Majestie of Scripture vindicated from criticisme. Many good answers to* Matth. 27. 9. *Erasmus faulty with Beza.* 36
6. *S. Augustine and Cyrill against them.* 40
7. *Masius and Junius prefer the Arabick and Syriack before the Greek. Junius recanteth. A little errour may (perhaps) be ascribed to the Transcribers. A generall errour in Greek and Latine may not be admitted in all copies of Scriptures.* ibid.

CHAP. IX.

1. THe *second answer disliked. Melchior Canus censured for saying, S. Steven his memorie failed him. His like proof from Jephthah his mistaking, answered.* 42
2. *Another argument of his, from* Matth. 2. 6. *answered.* 44
3. *Heinsius touched at, Cajetanus rejected, for holding that Adam could have understood all languages now in use. The manner of the confusion of tongues at Babel.* ibid.
4. *The Orientall languages, a goodly ornament, and necessary in some places. The Syriack enlightening the Greek.* 48

5. *The*

The Contents.

5. *The Jewish excommunications. Donations to Religious houses sealed up with curses to the infringers. M^r Selden in part defended, though his Historie of Tithes hath done hurt. MARAN-ATHA. The Amphibologie of* Act. 3. 21. *cleared by the Syriack. Ubiquitaries with Illyricus taxed. Heavens, and Heaven, taken for God.* ibid.

6. *Heinsius strictly examined, and rejected.* 54

7. *Things granted,* viz. *The inspirations and conceptions of holy Pen-men were under one or other language: in which conceptions they could not erre; nor could they erre in writing.* 57

8. *Questions handled at large: Whether it were necessary that the Scripture should be written: Whether the sacred writers wrote casually. Whether they were commanded to write: Whether they were compelled to write: Whether they understood all that they wrote: Whether they did reade profane Authours: Whether they studied the things before hand.* 68

9. *Conclusions against Heinsius. There was no difference between the Pen-men of the Divine writ of the Old and New Testament, in the point of conceiving and writing in different languages. We are not to have recourse to the thoughts of S. John, rather then his words. They had no libertie left them, to put in their own conceits, or in writing to adde or blot out what they had done. They had no libertie to cloath their inward apprehensions with words of their own. They did not conceive in one language, and write in another.* 95

CHAP. X.

1. READ *truth in the Greek and Latine texts of* Act. 7. 16. *The place expounded thus,* The Fathers were not Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but the twelve sonnes of Jacob. 112

2. *These twelve Fathers were not buried in* Abrahemio, *but in* Sychem. 114

3. Abraham *in this place is not taken* properly, *but* patronymicé. ibid.

4. Τῷ Συχέμ *used by S. Stephen, amphibolous, and expounded.* 116

5. *Two opinions concerning the place of* Acts 7. 16. *propounded.* 117

6. *The last preferred.* 118

CHAP. XI.

1. PINEDA *makes Moses to be one of the raised at Christs Passion, if once he died. Pineda censured for his asertion, or rather his* hypothesis. 119

2. David then arose in Pineda his judgement. 120
3. His argument answered. Bishop Bilson wavering, and rejected, as he rejecteth S. Augustine. ibid.
4. A demonstration (upon S. Augustine his ground, and Act. 2. 29.) that David was not raised, nor ascended bodily into heaven. 122
5. Davids sepulchre now kept by the Turk. 123

CHAP. XII.

1. Pineda doubteth whether Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, were raised at Christs passion, because there now are said to be some reliques of them; some at Rome; and some at Venice; saith Lorinus. 124
2. Other reliques. The table at which Christ ate with his Apostles. Some hairs, said to be the hairs of our glorious Saviour: others, of his all-gracious mother. A bone of Philips. A sandall of S. Peters. 125
3. S. Peters chain miraculous, as they report. ibid.
4. M. Mountague, now the reverend Bishop of Chichester, defended. ibid.
5. S. Pauls chain also miraculous, from Gregorie & Bellarmine. 126
6. False reliques taxt by Erasmus and Calvin. John the Baptist Teuiporei, supposed to have three heads at the least. Three or foure prepuces of Christ. ibid.
7. Reliques before Christs time. The ark. The holy oyl. The rod of Moses and Aaron. The throne of Eternitie phansied by the Jews. The horns of Moses. One finger of the holy Ghost. The Papists faults in forging of false reliques. 128
8. All Reliques are not false. What respects are to be denied to true Reliques: 130
9. What are to be given. 131
10. No likelihood of the raising up of Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, about Christs passion. 132

CHAP. XIII.

1. Pineda saith, Jonas arose then: and Noah. His reasons very shallow. 133
2. Daniel arose, saith Pineda from Nicetas. If Daniel arose, he arose but with one leg: the other leg is yet shewed at Vercellis. ibid.
3. Job arose now, saith Pineda. His proof lame. Jobs Epitaph poeticall. His sepulchrall pyramis made of imagination. 134
4. Job shall arise at the generall judgement. Pineda wrincheth the Scripture. ibid.
5. The end of Jobs book, according to some Greek copies: a double exposition of the words. 135
6. Jobs bodie supposed to be translated to Constantinople. ibid.
7. Bartholemaus Sibylla saith, S. Hierom is expresse, that the holy mother

mother of our Lord, and John the Evangelist, are bodily ascended. The like cited from Aquinas. And Holcot saith, That the glorious virgins bodie was not to be incinerated. Her supposed day of Assumption, most honoured among the Papists: and yet there is monstrous disagreeing among them who favour her Assumption. The last instances concern not our question. ibid.
8. Pineda presumed too farre upon uncertainties. Lorinus dareth not name any particularly that were raised. It cannot be known certainly. 136

CHAP. XIIII.

1. MY conjecture, that none of the Patriarchs or old Prophets were raised. 137
2. An objection, concerning Peters knowing of Moses and Elias on mount Tabor, answered. ibid.
3. A conjecture that the Saints who lived in Christs time, and died before him, were raised at his Passion: Who they were in most likelihood. When Joseph, the reputed father of Christ, did die. 138
4. The end, why they were raised. To whom they appeared. 139
5. A crotchet concerning the wives of dead men which have been raised. 140

CHAP. XV.

1. THe raised Saints ascended not into heaven with Christ, as is proved by Scripture, and reason. Suarez his shallow answer. Epiphanius strengthening my former positive conjectures. 141
2. If the raised ascended bodily into heaven, the Patriarchs should not be left behinde. 142
3. The ascending bodily of the Saints into heaven, not necessarie or behooffull. ibid.
4. Onely Christs bodie was seen ascending. 143
5. In likelihood, Christ would have shewed the Patriarchs unto some of his Apostles. ibid.

CHAP. XVI.

1. ANgels taken for men. Angels representing men, are called men. 144
2. The name JEHOVAH ascribed to an Angel representing JEHOVAH, say Estius and Tyranus. Picking of faults in the Apocryphall Scriptures, to be abhorred. ibid.
3. Drusius his povertie. The Apocrypha is too little esteemed. The Angel, who guided young Tobie, defended. 145
4. The great difference between Christs manner of rising, and Lazarus his. 146

The Contents.

CHAP. XVII.

1. THe place of Matth. 27. 53. is diverſly pointed, and, according to the pointing, is the diverſitie of meaning. The firſt implieth, that the Saints aroſe with Chriſt, though their graves were opened before. This interpretation is not ſo likely, though received generally. 148
2. The ſecond inferreth, that they aroſe before Chriſt, though they went not into the citie, till after his reſurrection. This is favoured by the Syriack, and is more agreeable to reaſon. ibid.
3. That the raiſed Saints died again, proved by reaſons, and Heb. 11. 40. 149
4. Chriſt the firſt-fruits of the dead, and of the raiſed. Angelicall aſſumed bodies were ſeen and heard; much rather ſhould mens bodies aſcending with Chriſt. 150
5. S. Auguſtine, Aquinas, Hierom, Chryſoſtom, Theophylact, Euthymius, Proſper, Soto, Salmeron, Barradius, Peterius, Valentian, affirm that the raiſed Saints died again. Franciſcus Lucas Brugenſis holds it likely. 151

CHAP. XVIII.

1. THe arguments of the contrarie opinion anſwered. Suarez, and eſpecially Cajetan, cenſured. 152
2. That by the holy Citie, Jeruſalem below was meant, proved at large. Joſephus and the Jews erring about the name of Jeruſalem. Hierom uncertain. 154
3. How the raiſed appeared. A difference between appearing as men, And appearing as newly raiſed men. Franciſcus Lucas Brugenſis rejected. 156
4. An argument of Maldonat anſwered by the prodigious Legend of Chriſtina, who died twice. No hurt is to man, if God will ſend his ſoul from an heavenly place, to live a while on earth again. 157
5. No harm to die twice. The difference between death compleat and incompleat. 159
6. God can diſpenſe with his own laws. 160

CHAP. XIX.

1. STrange conceits concerning Nero, from Suetonius, Tacitus, Hierom, Auguſtine. Nero ſuppoſed to be Antichriſt. 161
2. Another incredible relation of the Armenian, who is ſaid to have lived at Chriſts paſſion. The Armenians have their holy frauds. ibid.

The Contents of the third book.

CHAPTER I.

Sect. 1. *Many Papists are very peremptorie, that all and every one must die. Melchior Canus is more moderate. The words are onely indefinite, not universall.* 165

2. *Objections brought to prove, that universally all shall die. Their answers. Generall rules have exception. Even many learned Papists have acknowledged so much. The point handled, especially against Bellarmine.* 166

3. *Indefinites have not the force of universals. Even universals are restrained.* 169

4. *Salmeron bringeth many objections to prove an absolute necessitie that every one shall die. All his objections answered. Mans living in miserie is a kinde of death.* ibid.

CHAP. II.

1. *The third question resumed,* Whether every one must die? *The second part of the answer unto it,* That some have been excepted, as Enoch and Elias. *The controversie hath been exquisitely handled by King James, and Bishop Andrews.* 173

2. *Bellarmines third demonstration, that Antichrist is not yet come, propounded. The place of Malachi 4. 5. expounded by Bishop Andrews: and enlarged by my additions. The Papists objection answered.* 174

3. *The place of Ecclesiasticus 48. 10. concerning Elias examined.* 178

4. *Another place of Ecclesiasticus 44. 16. concerning Enoch, handled at large against Bellarmine. Enoch was never any notorious sinner, in some mens opinions: Others, otherwise. Their arguments for both opinions are onely probable; and answered. My opinion: and it confirmed. Some think Enoch died. Strange and various opinions concerning S. John the Evangelist, his living, death, and miraculous grave. More miracles, or else mistakings, in the Temples, of Christs Sepulchre, and his Assumption, about Jerusalem. S. John did die. Enoch did not die, but*

is living. Mine own opinion of the place Genes. 5, 24. Et non ipse: and it confirmed. A comparison between Enochs, Elisahs, and Christs ascension. The posture and circumstances of Christs ascending. 180

3. Bellarmine and others say, Paradise is now extant: In the earth, or in the aire, saith Lapide the Jesuit. The old translation censured. The heaven, into which Enoch and Elias were carried, was not Aërium nor Cœleste; but Supercœleste. The earthly Paradise is not extant, as it was. Salianus with others say truely, The materiall remaineth, not the formall: Superest quoad Essentiam, non quoad Ornatum: The Place is not removed, but the Pleasure, and Amenitie. Salianus his grosse Errour, That Enoch and Elias are kept by Angels, within the bounds of old Paradise on earth. 194

4. Enoch shall never die, as is proved from Hebr. 11. 5. Three evasions in answer to that place, confuted. Melchizedech, and strange things of him. The East-Indian language hath great affinitie with the Hebrew. An errour of moment in Guilielmus Postellus Baruntonius. Elias was not burnt by that fire which rapted him. Soul and bodie concur to make a man, saith Augustine from the great Marvels Varro, Vives vexed. Moses at the transfiguration, appeared in his own bodie. An idle conceit of Bellarmine, concerning Moses his face; and good observations of Origen upon that point. It is probable, that Elias was changed at his rapture, and had then a glorified bodie. An humane soul may possibly be in a mortall bodie in the third heaven. Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, are in their bodies in hell, properly so called; and alive in the hell of the damned. Ribera and Viegas confuted. Our Doctour Raynolds was not in the right in this matter. Some kinde of proofs, That Enoch and Elias are in glorified bodies in heaven. The place of Revel. 11. 7. concerning the two Witnesses winnowed by Bishop Andrews. Enoch and Elias are not those two witnesses. 200

CHAP. III.

1. Some others hereafter shall be excepted from death. The change may be accounted, in a generall large sense, a kinde of death. The Papists will have a reall proper death: Aquinas, an incineration. This is disproved 1. Thessal. 4. 17. which place is handled at large. The rapture of the godly is sine media morte, without death. The resurrection is of all together. The righteous prevent not the wicked, in that. 224

2. By the words of the Creed is proved, that some shall never die. The same is confirmed by other places of Scripture; with the consent of S. Augustine, and Cajetan. The definitions Ecclesiasticorum dogmatum, of the sentences and tenents of the

Church, *leave the words doubtfully. Rabanus his exposition rejected.* 227

3. *The place of S. Paul,* 2. Corinth. 5. 4. *evinceth, That some shall not die. Cajetan with us, and against Aquinas. Doctour Estius, and Cornelius à Lapide the Jesuit, approve Cajetan. S. Augustine is on our side; and evinceth it by Adams estate before the fall; which state Bellarmine denieth not. Salmerons objections answered.* 228

4. *Some shall be exempted from death, as is manifested* 1. Corinth. 15. 51. *The place fully explicated. The common Greek copies preferred. The Greek reading* πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, We shall not all sleep, *standeth with all truth, conveniencie, probabilitie, and sense. The other Greek* πάντες μὲν οὐ πάντως κοιμηθησόμεθα, We shall therefore all of us sleep, *and the more different Vulgat,* Omnes quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur, Indeed we shall all arise, but we shall not all be changed, *justly exploded, as adverse to sense.* 230

5. *The Pelagians, though accursed hereticks, yet held truely, That some shall not die. S. Augustine dubious. Others stick in his hesitancie. Yet other Fathers and late Writers are constant, That some shall be priviledged from death; yet, that* change *may be called a kinde of* death. 235

FINIS.

A Catalogue of the severall Authours quoted in these three books of *MISCELLANIES*.

A

Ben Ezra.
Abraham de Balmis.
Abulensis.
Adrichomius.
Cornelius Agrippa.
Albericus Gentilis.
Albertus Magnus.
Alchabitius.
Alexander ab Alexandro.
Ambrosius.
Bishop Andrews.
Anselmus.
Apollinaris.
Appianus Alexandrinus.
Aquila.
Aquinas.
Petronius Arbiter.
Arboreus.
Franciscus Aretinus.
Aretius.
Arias Montanus.
Aristoteles.
Athanasius.
Avenarius.
Augustinus.

B

Balthasar Bambach.
Moses Bar Cepha.
Baronius.
Barradius.
Basilius.
Beda.
Bellarminus.
Bernardus.
Bertram.
Beza.
Bilson.
Boëtius.
Bolducus.
Bonaventura.
Bosquier.
Brentius.
Broughton.
Lucas Brugensis.
Bucer.
Bullinger.
Busæus.

C

Celius secundus Curio.
Cæsaris commentaria.
Cajetanus.
Calvinus.
Melchior Canus.
Carafa.
Carthusianus.
Casaubonus.
Cassander.
Cassiodorus.
Catharinus.
Centumiatores.
Cevallerius.
Chaldee Targum.
Christopher Castrensis.
Chrysostomus.
Cicero.
Clemens Romanus.
Clemens Alexandrinus.
Joannes Climachus.
Philip de Comines.
Concilium Eliberitinum.
Concilium Mileyetanum.
Franciscus Collius.
Coverdale.
Cusanus.
Cyprianus.
Cyrillus Alexandrinus.

D

Damianus à Goes.
Rabbi David.
Del Rio.
Demosthenes.
Petrus Diaconus.
Didymus.
Dionysius Areopagita.
Dorotheus.
Drusius.
Andreas Dudithius.
Durandus.

E

Elias Levita.
Epimenides.
Epiphanius.
Erasmus.
Espencæus.
Estius.
Eugubinus.
Eusebius.
Eustathius Antiochenus.
Euthymius.

F

Abel Jansenius Fesulanus.
Felinus.

Felisius.
Fernelius.
Ferus.
Festus.
Feuardentius.
Dr. Field.
Dr. Fox.
Fulgentius.
Dr. Fulk.

G

Agneius.
Galenus.
Gasparus Sanctius.
Genebrardus.
Gerson.
Gorranus.
Gregorius.
Greg. Nyssenus.
Greg. de Valentia.
Gretser.

H

Alensis.
Haymo.
Heinsius.
Helvicus.
Hermogenes.
Hieronymus.
Hilarius.
Hippocrates.
Hippolytus.
Holcot.
Homerus.
Horatius.
Hugo Cardinalis.
Hugo Eterianus.

I

Acobus de Valentia.
K. James.
Jansenius.
Ignatius.
Illyricus.
Irenæus.
Isidorus.
Isidorus Pelusiota.
Josephus.
Justinus.
Benedictus Justinianus.

K

Emnitius.
Kimchi.

L

Aertius.
Cornelius à Lapide.
Laurentii historia Anatomica.
Joannes Leo.
Rabbi Levi.
Libavius.
Livius.
Lombardus.
Lorinus.
Ludolphus Carthusianus.
Ludovicus de Pontevallis Oletani.
Ludovicus Vives.
Lutherus.
Lyranus.

M

Ajoranus.
Maldonatus.
Marianus Scotus.
Marsilius Andreasius.
[redacted]
Martinus Cantipratensis.
Justin Martyr.
Masius.
Matthew Paris.
Melchior Flavius.
Rabbi Menachem.
Mercer.
Minshew.
Mollerus.
Bishop Mountague.
Lord Michael de Montaigne.
Montanus.
Peter Morales.
Mr. Pines Morison.
Rabbi Moses.
Peter Moulin.
Muncer.
Musculus.

N

Ier. Natalis.
Nazianzenus.
Nicephorus.
Nicetas.
Nonnus.

O

Ckam.
Oecolampadius.
Oecumenius.
Jofrancus Offusius.
Olympiodorus.
Origenes.

P

Acianus.
Pagninus.
Paracelsus.
Paulinus.
Pererius.
Peter Martyr.
Petrus Pomponatius.
Philo Judæus.
Photius.
Pighius.
Pineda.
Plato.
Plinius.
Plotinus.
Plutarchus.
Polybius.
Julianus Pomerius.
Porphyrius.
Postellus.
Primasius.
Procopius Gazæus.
Propertius.
Prosper.
Ptolomeus.

R

Dr. Raynolds.
Ribera.
Richeomus Jesuita.
Rodulphus Cluniacensis Monachus.
Rosinus.
Ruffinus.
Rupertus.

S

Emmanuel Sa.
Salianus.
Mr. Salkeld.
Salmanticensis Judæus.
Salmeron.
Rabbi Salomon.
Mr. Sands.
Sasbout.
Scaliger.
Scharpius.
Dr. Sclater.
Scotus.
Mr. Selden.
Seneca.
Septuaginta.
Mr. Sheldon.
Barthol. Sibylla.
Sixtus Senensis.
Sleidanus.
Socrates.
Sohnius.
Sophronius.
Soto.
Stapleton.
Robertus Stephanus.
Stow.
Strabo.
Suarez.
Suetonius.
Suidas.
Surius.
Symmachus.

T

Tacitus.
Tertullian.
Theodoretus.
Theodosius.
Theophylactus.
Petrus Thyræus.
Tichonius.
Titus Bostrensis.
Toletus.
Tostatus.
Solomo Trecensis.
Tremellius.
Trelcatius.
Historie of the councell of Trent.
Turrianus.

V

Valla.
Terentius Varro.
Vasques.
Vatablus.
Didacus Vega.
Ludovicus Vertomannus.
Blasius Viegas.
Joannes Viguerius.
Godfridus Abbas Vindocinensis.
Virgilius.
Vorstius.
Bishop Usher.
Leonardus de Utino.

W

Whitakerus.
Willet.

Z

Zanchius.
Zimenes.

O Bleſſed God, Father, Sonne, and holy Ghoſt, whoſe deſerving mercie to me hath been ſo infinite, that nothing in earth, which I enjoy, is worthy enough to be offered unto thee: yet becauſe thou haſt ſo plentifully rewarded the widow of Sarepta, for ſharing that little which ſhe had, unto the Prophet; and haſt promiſed even the kingdome of heaven to them, who in thy name give a cup of water, of cold water; and haſt moſt graciouſly accepted the pooreſt oblations, both of the goats hair toward thy Tabernacle, and the widows two mites into the treaſurie; receive (I moſt humbly beſeech thee) the free-will-offering of my heart, and weak endeavours of my hand, in this intended ſervice: and as thou didſt fill Bezaleel and Aholiab with an excellent ſpirit of wiſdome and ſubtill inventions, to finde out all curious works, to the beautifying of thy Tabernacle: ſo I moſt meekly deſire thee, to enlighten my ſoul, to elevate my dull underſtanding; that I may ſearch for ſuch ſecret things as may be found, and finde ſuch things as may be ſearched for lawfully and modeſtly; and that I may, like Joſhuahs good ſpies, acquaint my ſelf and others with the deſert wayes, and the ſeverall tracts and paths, which our ſouls, immediately after death, muſt travell and paſſe over, toward the Celeſtiall Canaan. O God, my good God, grant me to accompliſh this, through the ſafe conduct of Him, who is the faithfull Guide, the onely Way, the Light, and Joy of my ſoul, my Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST. So be it, moſt gracious Redeemer, So be it.

MISCELLANIES OF DIVINITIE.

THE FIRST BOOK.

CHAP. I.

Sect. 1. *THe subject of the whole Work. The reason why I chose the Text of* Hebrews 9.27. *to discourse upon. The division of it.*

2 *Amphibologie prejudiciall to truth. Death appointed by* GOD, *yet for Adams fault. The tree of life kept from Adam not by phantasticall Hob-gobins, but by true Angels, and a flaming sword brandishing it self. Leviticall ceremonies dead, buried, deadly. Things redeemed dispensed with, yet still appointed.*

3 *The Kingdome of Death reigning over all. Bodily death here meant; and onely once to be undergone.*

4 Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο *impleth not necessarily the longinquitie of future times intercurrent, but rather a demonstration that other things were precedent.* Τὸ [after] *doth often signifie an immediate succession. Judgement here taken for an act of justice.*

5 *The generall Judgement here understood by Oecumenius & Bellarmine. The second book of Esdras apocryphal, and justly refused. More then the generall Judgement is meant. Even the particular judgement also is vouched by many authorities. Three questions arising from the former part of these words.*

SECT. 1.

BEcause I intend (by GODS gracious assistance) to explain at large the nature both of humane souls and bodies (so farre as concerns a Divine) and to bring to light things hidden, secret, and strange; and more especially to unfold the estate and passages of mens souls in their origination, and likewise in their separation from their bodies: also in their particular

judgement, and their conduct or conveyance to pleasure or pain, with all the known occurrences which present themselves *ab instanti terræ motus*, from the last minute of life, till the said souls shall discern the approach of CHRIST's second coming. And because I may (if GOD grant me life) in a second Tractate write of the Resurrection, and generall Judgement, and of the same humane souls, from the first instant of CHRIST's glorious appearing, till they are placed with their bodies in their eternall mansions; and of their blisse or punishments, with other particularities which concern that new World: In these regards I have chosen this Text, Heb. 9. 27.

Ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις

For these are words of great force and moment, serving aptlie to my purpose, as including and containing whatsoever may be expressed or conceived, concerning this subject, under these two Propositions,

1. *It is appointed unto Men once to die.*
2. *After this* (*is, or cometh*) *Judgement.*

First, the particular Judgement immediately upon Death: Secondly, the generall Judgement, in that great day of Retribution, of which in due time hereafter, if it please GOD.

2. Now because whatsoever is ambiguous and of divers significations, is an enemie to the understanding, and that we are counselled by Luther to avoid ἀμφιβολίας in matter of Religion, as we would flee from a Devil; let me remove doubtfulnesse from the words, and drawing away the overshadowing veil or curtain of ambiguity, seek for the true sense of each term questionable. And first of the first, ἀπόκειται. *It is appointed.* Some things man appointeth, and GOD some others. This appointment is the sanction, not of Man, but of GOD. Of things appointed by GOD, some are so *Lege naturæ institutæ*, some *destitutæ*: some primitively, some occasionally. This appointment came *lege naturæ destitutæ*, saith Gorranus: *à* DEO *ultore*, saith Bosquier in his *Terror orbis*, the Elements having permission to destroy themselves, and the things compounded of them: GOD not onely driving Adam out of Paradise, but, by fire and sword fortifying against his approach the way of the tree of life, *even whilest Adam lived*, saith Epiphanius Hæres. 64: *yea till the Flood* (if Saint Chrysostome misguide us not) *with strange and uncouth assistance of armed spirits*: which were not φαντάσματα, terrible and horrible visions; of affrighting fire in one place, of fire in the fashion of a flaming sword in an other place, of dreadfull shapes of beasts otherwhere, as Theodoret, and after him and from him, Procopius Gazæus do fancie: but indeed there were true Angels, *or Cherubims*; *and a flaming sword which turned every way*, Genes. 3. 24. More then one

Angel,

Angel, and more then two, (I know not how many,) and perhaps many swords, every Angel having at least one sword, a two edged sword (as some will have it) which they brandished and flourished with, to the terrour of our sinfull parents. For what should more Angels do with one sword onely? Therefore the *flaming sword* is to be understood for more swords, the singular for the plural, by a *Synecdoche*, the certain number for the uncertain; which is usuall in Scripture, or els, besides the astonishing sight of Angels, prepared by an unknown manner and means to defend the straits and passages unto Eden, there was a sword also which turned it self every way, *The edge of a sword brandishing, and turning it self*, as Tremellius and the Interlineary Bible do read, and that most agreeable to the Original. Again, of things appointed by God consequentially: first, some have been wholly abrogated, as the Levitical ceremonies, which now are *not onely* * *dead, but also deadly*, causing just damnation to the users of them: because they deny in effect that Christ, who is the substance of those types, is incarnate. It is true, that awhile after Christs resurrection the Jewish rites continued, for the Synagogue was to be brought honourably to her grave, and at Jerusalem especially, S. James advised S. Paul to observe the Ceremonial Law: yea *there were fifteen Bishops of Jerusalem after Christs time, who all successively were of the circumcision, and one Mark was the first uncircumcised Bishop in the time of Adrian, after the destruction both of the Temple and City*, saith * Nicephorus. But in other places it was otherwise: for though S. Paul did circumcise Timothie, *because of the Jews which were in those quarters*, (which he might well do, by reason the mother of Timothie was a Jewesse) yet Titus, * *being a Greek, was not compelled to be circumcised*, no though he was at Jerusalem. Yea S. Paul telleth the Gentiles, with great majestie and solemnitie, * *Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing*. Secondly, the things appointed by God have been redeemed, as the first-born, *Exod.* 34.20. and tithes, *Levit.* 27. 31. and these being instituted by God to one end, were by their redemption purchased to other uses, yet made they no gain, but redeemed them at a dearer rate: see *Numb.* 18. 16. and *Levit.* 27. 31. Thirdly, some other things appointed by God have been dispensed withall. Thus circumcision, while the Israelites travelled in the wildernes, and awhile after, was omitted above fourtie yeares, and again resumed into practice, *Jos.* 5. 2. Thus the Passeover, by one that was not clean, or was in his journey, might be forborn, *Numb.* 9. 12. To this third kinde and sort of things by God appointed, do I reduce this in my text. This appointed death is not wholly abrogated, it is not redeemed, and yet sometimes it hath been, sometimes it shall be dispensed withall (of which hereafter) and yet for all

* *Acies gladii sese vibrantis & vertentis.*

* Non tantùm *mortua* sed etiam *mortifera*. Vide Aquin. 1. 2. quæst. 103. art. 4.

* Niceph. lib. 3. cap. 25.

* Acts 16. 3.

* Gal. 2. 3.

* Gal. 5. 2.

all this dispensation, it is truely said, ἀπόκειται, not *It was appointed*, as having reference to what onely was past; but *It is appointed*. It is a yoke, that neither our fathers did, nor we shall ever shake off: and not onely labour and travell is an *heavy yoke upon the sonnes of Adam*, but much more death. Neither hath the worlds redeemer freed us from the stroke, but from the curse of death; for even hitherto,

Pale death doth knock with equall power
At th' poore mans doore and kingly tower.

The grave yet gapeth: and though myriads of myriads have died before: though Paracelsus promised immortality in this life, (and perhaps therefore was cut off in the prime of his yeares) yet death is *the house appointed for all livings and every man shall draw after him, as there are innumerable before him*. Of the longest liver hath been said in the end, βεβίωται, *His life is past*: or as the Romanes, when they were loth to say one was dead, spake significantly to the sense, yet mildly by this word *Vixit, He had his time, he did sometimes live*. And it is the condition of all times, THOU SHALT DIE THE DEATH.

3 ἀποθανεῖν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. The universall note or particle is not added. It is not said, πᾶσι δὲ ἀποθανεῖν, yet sure it is included, and so meant; Not Christ himself, the destroyer of death, is exempted; nor his thrice-blessed Mother, not fair Absalom, nor strong Sampson, nor wise Solomon, nor traffic Achitophel. It is appointed to all, men and women; no sex is freed, no nation priviledged, no age excepted. If some few have been dispensed withall, I will say with S. Augustine, *Other are the bounds of humane things, other the signes of divine power: some things are done naturally, and some miraculously*. We speak of the ordinarie course. *It is appointed for all men* TO DIE, ἀποθανεῖν. Death is a name of sundry significations, and it is taken diversly: for there is

The last death, by the losse of glory.
The death of the soul, by the losse of grace.
The death of the body, by the losse of the soul.

If it be demanded, saith S. Augustine, what death God meaneth to our first parents, Whether the death of the body, or of the soul, or of the whole man, or that which is called THE SECOND DEATH; *we must, saith he, answer; He threatneth all.* The death of the soul began immediately upon their eating, and is evidenced by their hiding themselves, and shame to be seen. The death of the body presently seconded it, *it suddenly becomes mortall*, saith Theodoret. The sentence of mortality God called *death*, in Symmachus his exposition: *For after the divine sentence, every day (that I may so speak) he looked for death*, as it is in the same Theodoret. As we now expect the resurrection and life eternall every moment: so Adam every minute looked for death; I am sure he deserved it. Peter Martyr on 1. *Cor.* 15. 12. *Our first parents perished*

*Eccles 40. 1.

*Pallida mors aquo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas, Regumque turres. Horat. Carm. l. 1. Od. 4.

*Job. 30. 23. and 21. 33.

Eccles 14. 17.

*Alii sunt humanarum limites rerum, alia divinarum signa virtutum: alia naturaliter, alia mirabiliter fiunt. Aug. lib. de cura pro mortuis gerenda cap. 16

*Aug. De Civit. Dei lib. 13. cap. 12.

Consule, si placet, ingeniosum ejus Tractatum, cap. 15. ejusdem libri.

Theod. in Gen. quæst. 38.

ed so soon as they transgressed: because no other death is to be imagined but a departure from life, and we have no life out of God. Therefore they died, because they departed from God: and their soul was not snatched away from their bodie, but in a manner buried in it. For the present, our life is not a life, but a death. Of the bodily death onely are the words of my Text to be understood, being a prime commentarie on *Genes.* 3.19. *Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.* It is appointed for men ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, *Once to die.* **What fall is in the devil, that death is in man.* They fell but once, we die but once. *We must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again.* 2. Sam. 14. 14. Waters once spilt embrace the dust, and are not gathered up again, nor can be spilt again. *Christ tasted death for every man,* Hebr. 2. 9. As Christ being once dead, *dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him,* Rom. 6. 9. so is it regularly and ordinarily with all other, one corporall death sufficeth. *It is appointed unto men* ONCE *to die.*

4 Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις, *But after this the judgement.* Let me speak of the words severally, and then in a lump or masse together. That these articles, *Post, tum, mox, modo, After, then, anon, presently,* and the like, are taken as large for some years before or after: you may see it proved in *Albericus Gentilis. The Scripture thus, Genes. 38.1. *At that time* (*But it was ten yeares,* saith Tremellius) Exod. 2. 11. *It came to passe in those dayes:* and he meaneth fourty yeares. Matt. 3. 1. *In those dayes:* that is, twenty and five yeares after. Luke 23.43. *To day* is taken for *presently.* Aretius hath it, μετὰ τοῦτο, *Upon that,* or *presently after that.* And questionles that is the meaning: for though τὸ *After* may be interpreted *long after,* as the word *proximus,* contrarilie, doth not enforce necessarily a nearenes: *Proximus huic, longo sed proximus intervallo,* said Virgil excellently; *He was next, but a great distance between:* yet in the holy Scripture, μετὰ τοῦτο, *after that,* doth most times rather intimate the procedure and order of things done, then intend a large intercedencie of time. John 19. 28. μετὰ τοῦτο, *After that, Jesus saith I thirst:* you must not understand it, *long after,* not yeares, moneths, weeks, dayes, or houres after that; for our Saviour hung upon the crosse not above foure houres, and many things were said and done before this. So in this place, μετὰ τοῦτο doth not evidently inferre a spacious distance of time, but by the words *after that,* we may say is meant, not *long after,* but *presently,* or *thereupon, judgement cometh after death.* Which I the more confidently do so interpret, because I know no place in the divine Writ, where μετὰ τοῦτο doth signifie a vast and immense longitude of time: but there are also, besides them, other evident words, arguing such pawses and spaces of times. As also, because the word μετὰ or *post* it self is so expounded by Pererius on John 5. 4. **After the troubling*

Primi parentes quam transgressi sunt, illico perierè: quandam mortem aquum est censenda, quam recessus à vita: nec vitam habemus citra Deum. Quare mortui sunt, quia à Deo recesserunt; & eorum anima non fuit à corpore avulsa, sed in eo quodammodo sepulta: in præsentia, non vitam, sed mortem vivimus.

*Quod casus in diabolo, id in homine mors.

*Alb. Gent. disput. ad 1. lib. Maccab. cap. 3.

bling of the water, signifieth as much as if it had been said, After the moving and troubling of the water was begun, saith he: for the infirm did wait and expect the moving of the water, ver. 3. and the impotent man said to Christ, ver. 7. *I have no man to put me into the pool, when the water is troubled*, that is, so soon as the water beginneth to be troubled: for the πρῶτος ἐμβὰς, *the first descendant* into the water, μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν, *after the troubling*, was healed. Therefore you must expound the word *after*, for *immediately after*, instantly there upon. For if he had first stepped in, he had been healed: whereas if you expound, *after the motion*, that is, *a long while after*, he might indeed have been put into the water, but never the nearer to be healed. So also μετὰ ταῦτα, John 5. 19. and divers other places evince, that the phrase implieth not length of time intervenient, but rather an historicall narration of things succeeding, and sometimes depending one of the other. So here, first death, *after that*, (i) shortly after that, cometh κρίσις, *judicium*, judgement. Judgement is taken two wayes; first, for the assenting or dissenting of the intellect; in this sense we say, *I like or like not such a mans judgement*: so judgement is taken for ones opinion, perswasion, or determination. The Text is not meant of judgement in this sense. Secondly, it is used for an act of justice, giving to every man what belongeth to him. Thus is it here taken. An act of justice not proceeding from man, but from God, and terminated upon man. The judgements of God upon man are manifold, both in this present life, and in the life to come. The judgement here mentioned, is the judgement after death. And of judgements after death there are two, { Private of souls, / Publick of bodies and souls.

Whether of these two judgements is to be understood, we hope to finde out, when we have considered the last thing propounded, the words in a lump together, μετὰ τὴν κρίσιν, *After that the judgement.*

5 That there are two judgements after this life, we take it here for granted; but by God's assistance it shall be, in a fitter place of this discourse, demonstrated at large. But whether the generall judgement of souls and bodies be especially here meant, or the private and particular judgement of souls, or both of them, is the question now, and must be determined by authority and reason.

Oecumenius is for the first way, and wittily interprets these words; as if it had been said, *When all and every one which ever were in the world, are dead; then followeth, after the universall death, universall judgement.* To him assenteth * Bellarmine, and the book of Esdras long before either of them, * *After death shall the judgement come, when we shall live again*; &c. where the generall judgement is pointed at, and not the particular. And

(i) Post motionem aquæ, significat idem ac si dictum fuisset, Post quam capta erat motio, & turbatio aquæ.

* Bell. de Purgat. lib. 2. cap. 4.
* 2. Esdr. 14. 35.

from hence S. Paul may be thought to have borrowed the words. I answer, that the Apostle had them not from that author; for *there is neither Greek, nor Hebrew copie of that book of Esdras*, * saith Bellarmine, from S. Hierome; onely it is preserved in Latine, and *no Councel ever held it canonicall*, saith Bellarmine. Again, I can finde no passage of either of these books of Esdras cited in the New Testament; though out of other apocryphall books there be divers things taken. And though Ambrose cited the second book of Esdras (commonly called *the fourth book of Esdras*) in his book *de Bono mortis*, and in his second book on Luke, and in his second epistle to Horontianus; yea, though * Sixtus Senensis saith of Ambrose, that Ambrose thought Esdras wrote this book by divine revelation, and that S. Paul did follow Esdras in those things which he hath concerning the diversitie of order of glory, of brightnes in the elect when they shall be raised: yet Sixtus Senensis himself esteemeth not the book to be either canonicall, or deutero-canonicall, but meerely apocryphall: and *in it*, he saith, *are* * *some suspected doctrines manifestly gainsaying the rules of orthodox faith*: and he instanceth in the * fourth chapter, maintaining, * *that all soules are kept in certain receptacles or chambers in hell, till the generall judgement*. Sixtus Senensis addeth, that S. Ambrose seemeth to approve of this opinion. *Also*, saith he, in chap. 6. vers. 49. *there are fabulous Jewish fooleries, of Hemoth and Leviathan, two fishes*. Upon these grounds I may confidently say, that though some ignorant people might be seduced by this book, (and thence, perhaps, arose the error of the soules not being judged till the resurrection) yet S. Paul would never take a testimony from that book, which hath such palpable untruths, and is not extant in Greek or Hebrew. Moreover it hath no place vouchsafed in Arias Montanus his Interlineary Bible: nor doth Emanuel Sa comment on any word of it: and Bellarmine himself marvelleth why Genebrard would have it held canonicall. Estius saith, * *That book hath no authoritie in the Church*. But I return to the first exposition.

The generall judgement may be meant, and is involved; I will not deny it. Yet these reasons perswade me, that the particular judgement is not excluded. First, if the Apostle had intended it onely of the generall judgement, it is likely he would, as he doth in other places, have used fittest expressions, and terms properly advancing to that sense: as thus, *at the second coming of Christ*, or, *At the end of the world*, or, *when the corruptible hath put on incorruption*, or, *after the resurrection cometh judgement*. But, since it is written, *It is appointed for men to die, and after that cometh judgement*; to interpret it onely of the generall judgement, is, in my opinion, to leave a χάσμα μέγα, a great gulf between death and judgement: which *how* will hand-

* Bell. de Verbo Dei, lib. 1. cap. 20.

* Sixt. Sen Bib. Sanct. lib. 1.

* *Quadam suspecta dogmata, regulis orthodoxæ fidei aperte contradicentia.*

* 2. Esdr. 4. 35. 36. 38. 41. 42.

* *Animas autem detineri quibusdam abditis receptaculis in inferno.*

* *Liber ille non habet autoritatem in Ecclesia* Est. in 2. Sent. Dist. 19. num. 4.

somely

ſomely be filled up, if there be reference to the particular judgement.

Secondly, what if I ſay, that the words do denote rather the not paſſing of judgement while we live, and the beginning of it to be ſhortly after death, excluding judgement in this life, and placing death rather before judgement, then any great diſtance betwixt death and judgement? according to the native uſe of the words μετὰ τοῦτο, of which before.

The ſecond expoſition is of Gregory de Valentia,* who applieth the words to the particular judgement immediately upon death. So doth Ludovicus de ponte Vallis Oletani,* who ſets it down as a veritie of faith,* *Concerning the particular judgement of the ſoul, which is done immediately after death; every one is judged inviſibly preſently after his death*: and evinceth it by this Text. So doth Joannes* Viguerius. * Buſæus the Jeſuite likewiſe accounteth* *the ſecond laſt thing, to be the particular judgement following death immediately; the ſeveritie whereof*, ſaith he, *Job the holy patient feared.* Job 31. 14. *What ſhall I do when God riſeth up? and when he viſiteth, what ſhall I anſwer him?* S. Ambroſe on this place hath it thus,* *Every one ſhall be judged after death according to their own deſervings. Which words do point at the particular judgement*, ſaith Suarez. Laſtly, leſt I may ſeem too eager againſt the ſecond book of Eſdras, let me borrow a teſtimony or two from thence. 2 Eſdr. 9. 11, 12. *They that loth-ed my law, while they had yet libertie and place of repentance open unto them, muſt know it after death by pain.* And 3. Eſdr. 7. 56. *While we lived and committed ſinne, we conſidered not that we ſhould* BEGIN *to ſuffer for it* AFTER DEATH. Whence we may probably collect, That the beginning of puniſhment is immediately after death, upon the particular judgement; and the increaſe or additament at the generall judgement. 2 That ſome are in torments before the generall day of retribution. 3 That the beginning to ſuffer, is not after a long time, (GOD onely knoweth how long) but after death, yea preſently after it. All theſe proofs on each ſide make way for the third and beſt interpretation, That the Apoſtle meaneth not onely either of theſe judgements, but both of them. Benedictus Juſtinian on theſe words, thus,* *After every ones death private judgement follows; in which every one is to give an account of his actions: after the end of the world ſhall be the judgement of all, both men and devils. Of both the Apoſtle may be underſtood*, ſaith he. So alſo Salmeron, and Hugo Cardinalis, and Carthuſianus. Oecolampadius thus,* *Whether you underſtand the ſpeciall judgement, or the generall, it matters not.*

Thus have I brought you back to the point where I firſt began: That this text is fitted to my intentions, affording me juſt liberty to write whatſoever may be conceived or expreſſed, con-

* Tom. 4. Diſp. 1. quæſt. 22. punct. 9.

* Part. 1. Meditat. medit. 9.

* *De particulari judicio animæ, quod fit proximè poſt mortem, judicium ſingulorum exerceri inviſibiliter ſtatim poſt cujuſque mortem.*

* Viguer. Inſtit. pag. 692.

* Buſ. initio Panarii Antidororum ſpiritual.

* *Secundum noviſſimum eſt judicium particulare mortem proximè conſequens.*

* *Poſt mortem judicabitur unuſquiſque juxta merita ſua.*

* *Poſt cujuſque obitum, ſequitur judicium privatum, in quo quiſque ſuarum actionum reddit uſus eſtrationem: poſt finem mundi erit judicium omnium, tum hominum tum dæmonum.*

* *Sive ſpeciale judicium intelligas, ſive generale, nihil refert.*

concerning the estate of humane souls in their animation or in death, or after it in the life future; because the words must be expounded of both Judgements. And now the text being cleared from ambiguities, the terms explained, the state being made firm and sure, not rolling and changeable; and being fixed upon its basis and foundation, three questions do seem to arise from the first words of the text, and each of them to crave its answer, before I come to my main intendment.

First, How and when Death came to be appointed for us?

Secondly, Whether Adam and his children, all and every one without priviledge or exception, must and shall die? *It is appointed for men to die.*

Thirdly, Whether they that were raised up from the dead at any time, did die the second time? *It is appointed to men once to die.*

O Gracious Lord, who orderest all things sweetly, and who dost dispose whatsoever man doth purpose; I humbly implore thy powerfull guidance, and enlightning assistance, in all this work, for his sake, who is Alpha and Omega, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, thy onely Sonne, my blessed Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

1. How GOD is immortall, how angels and the souls of men, how Adams body was mortall, and yet immortall, though compounded of contraries.

2 Aristotles last words in his death. Holcot of the Philosophers pray for him. Aristotle canonized by his followers. Plato and Aristotle compared. Vives taxed. Adams body was not framed of the earth, or dust of Paradise.

3. Adam should not have been subject to outward evils, since he was Lord of the creatures: inward distemper he could not have. Adams bodily temperature: Christs, who was fairer then the children of Adam: the helps for Adams body, meat, drink, and sleep

4. Divers opinions of the tree of life. If Adam had eaten of the tree of life before or after his fall, he had lived for ever. If he had not sinned he had not died, though he had not tasted of the tree of life. To what use the tree of life should have served.

5. The Cardinall of Millan: Cardinall Caietan, Rupertus the Jesuite, Julius Pomerius and S, Augustine think that Adam could not have died, if he had not sinned. The book of Wisedome, Holcot, Doctor Estius, and two passages of Scripture Canonical, are authorities evincing that Adam had in the state of innocency an immortall body.

1. TO the full answering of the first question, how or why Death was appointed for us, I shall need to cleare but these two points;

That Adam for sinne was appointed to die.

That Adams sinne, and punishment was propagated to us.

Thus sinne was the mother of death, thus we were appointed to die, because of sinne. As a preparative to the first of these two points, I hold it fit to demonstrate, that Adam at first was made an immortall creature.

Concerning Adams soul, and the spirits of all men descended from him, that they are immortall, I hope to prove it so soundly in an other part of this tractate, that I will fear no other reproof but this, that I bring too much proof for it. Therefore supposing, or rather borrowing that truth (which by

Gods

Gods grace shall be repayed with interest. I now come to shew that Adams bodie was created immortall.

Immortall I say, not as God is immortall, who neither had beginning, nor shall have end; with whom is no shadow of change, much lesse any reall, substantiall change; who hath, as all other good things else, so, immortalitie eminently; and so eminently, that our Apostle in some sort excludeth all others, and appropriateth it to him, saying, 1. Tim. 6. 16. *God onely hath immortalitie.*

Neither was the body of Adam immortall, as the Angelicall spirits, and soules of men, which had a beginning, but shall have no end. Nor immortall, as the counsels of God, which had no beginning, but shall have an end.

His bodie was not eternall, but eviternal, or immortall; not absolutely immortall, but conditionally: it should never have tasted death, if he had not first tasted of the forbidden fruit. Immortall, not as if it could not die, but because it might and could have lived ever. He had not *non posse mori*, and so he was mortall; he had *posse non mori*, and so was immortall. As *mortall* is taken for *earthly, animall*, and contradistinct to *spirituall*, so his bodie was mortall and terrene, not spirituall or celestiall: As he could not possibly die, unlesse he had sinned, his very bodie was immortall.

In the Schoole-phrase, thus: both *mortall* and *immortall* are taken two wayes,

Mortall, for one { who must needs die: thus Adam was not mortall in innocency, but by sinne was made mortall. / who can die: thus was he mortall, yet onely *in sensu diviso*; because he could sinne, therefore could die.

Immortall, for one { who cannot die: so Adam in innocency was not immortall, save onely *in sensu conjuncto*: he was immortall and could not die, unlesse he sinned. / upon whom there is no necessity laid that he should die: thus was he simply immortall.

Lumbard thus, *Adam had in his nature some mortalitie, to wit an aptnes to die, so he had in his nature some immortalitie, that is, an aptnes by which he might not die.* 2. Sent. dist. 19. lit. F.

Further, as some have said, Adam was neither mortall, not immortall (for thus wrote Petrus Diaconus, and Fulgentius, and Maxentius) so others have written, that Adam was made both mortall and immortall: and all and every one of these in some sense is most true. Augustine saith that *Adams bodie before sinne may be said to be mortall in one respect, and immortall in another*, as he there proveth at large. Hierome hath a different strain, and an unusuall phrase in one of his * epistles, wherein he

[a] *Adam in natura sua habuit mortalitatem quandam, scilicet aptitudinem moriendi: ita aliquam immortalitatem in natura sua habuit, id est, aptitudinem qua posset non mori.*

* Pet. Diac. de Gratia Christ. lib. 1. cap. 6. Fulg. lib. 2. cap. 13. Max. Profess. Fidei suæ, cap. 8.

[b] *Corpus Adæ ante peccatum, & mortale secundum aliam, & immortale secundum aliam causam dici potest.* De Genesi ad literam lib. 6. cap. 25.

* Epist. ad Pammachium Concordiensem.

he maketh the body to be eternall, till the serpent, by his sinne, prevailed against Adam; and so both a second kinde of immortality to the body, because some of the first ages lived so long a time, as about, or above 900 yeares.

Even they who say Adams body was mortall, agree in sense with me. They distinguish thus. *It is one thing to be mortall, and another thing to be subject to death.* If they grant to us, that he was not obnoxious to death, and could not die without sinne, I will not be offended much, though they say he was mortall. *As this our flesh, which now we have, is not therefore not to be wounded, because there is no necessitie that it should be wounded: so the flesh of Adam in paradise was not therefore not mortall, because there was no necessitie that it should die*, saith Augustine. So that this is but a meer logomachy. They who call him *mortall* expound themselves, that he could not *mori*, unlesse he had sinned, and I mean no more, when I say he was *immortall*; that is, he could not have died in the state of innocencie without a precedent transgression he could not have been subject or obnoxius to death. They say, though he should not have died, yet he was mortall. I say, he was therefore only immortall, because in that blessed estate he could not die. Whether of these two contraries, *Mortall* or *Immortall*, do best fit Adam before he sinned, let the reader judge.

De peccat. Meritis & Remiss. l. 1. c. 3.

As bodies are compounded of contrarities, they are subject to dissolution; to the evidencing whereof, let me recount what Holcot saith on Wisedome 12. 22. upon these words, *We should look for mercy.*

Aristotle, saith Holcot, *spake these his last words*, I REJOYCE THAT I GO OUT OF THE WORLD, WHICH IS COMPOUNDED OF CONTRARIES, BECAUSE EACH OF THE FOURE ELEMENTS IS CONTRARY TO OTHER, AND THEREFORE HOW CAN THIS BODY COMPOUNDED OF THEM, LONG ENDURE? *Then he dyed, and the Philosophers prayed for him*, saith Holcot. And because he did scorne to be behinde the Philosophers in love to Aristotle, Holcot himself secondeth their prayers, thus, * *He that receiveth the soules of Philosophers, let him receive thy soul.* This he speaketh to Aristotle, by a part of that little Rhetorick that Holcot had, or was used in his dayes: or otherwise it might be the prayer of the Philosophers related by Holcot; for the words are doubtfull. No marvell therefore if after this, our Christian Peripatetick, the Divines of Culleyn, have made Aristotle a Saint, as they did, if we beleeve † Cornelius Agrippa, and perhaps prayed to him as devoutly as others prayed for him. * *They count him among the Gods*, saith Agrippa in his 45 Chapter, though Agrippa himself be of a contrarie opinion, for he saith, * *Aristotle killed himself, being made a sacrifice worthy of the Devils.* Sure I am, I have

* Ille qui suscipit animas philosophorum, suscipiat animam tuam.

† Corn. Agr. De Vanit. Scient.

* Divis annumerant.

* Ipsis Dæmonibus dignum fatis sacrificium

I have read in a book *of the life and death of Aristotle*, in the beginning whereof the Poët prayeth to God from heaven to help him to write, concerning Aristotle, acceptable things: and to speak in his words,

De sapiente viro, cujus cor lumine mixto
Luxisti Diva super omnes Philosophia;
Quem si non fractum, lethi per sibilla actum,
Adventus prolis Diva, veri quoque Solis
Post se liquisset, fidei qui vi micuisset,
Creditur à multis doctoribus, artis adulti,
Quod fidei lumen, illustrans mentis acumen,
Defensatorem vix seculisset meliorem.

From whence the commenting questionist examineth, Whether Aristotle would have been in an high degree the great champion of the Christian faith, if he had lived after Christs time. And he resolveth affirmatively: because Aristotle had the best intellect among all the creatures under the sunne: for *supernaturals* (saith he) *are given according to the disposition of naturals, with mens endeavors, grace distilling on man, according as he well useth the talent of nature.* But at the end of that book, the Expositor strikes all dead in these words, * *Concluding finally, and with truth, I say, that Aristotle (who heartily implored the mercy of God, praying,* O BEING OF BEINGS HAVE MERCY ON ME,*) by an holy and bodily death translated* † *to the Chair of Estate, the Seat-royall, and Throne of everlasting blisse.* Yea, he holds the man mad who doubts hereof; because Aristotle had the knowledge of the Almighty, because he loved God as the fountain of all goodnesse, because Aristotle was as necessary before the incarnation of Christ, as the giving of grace necessarily presupposeth nature. Whereupon he presumeth that Aristotle was * *the forerunner of Christ in naturals, as John the Baptist in supernaturals; and that he was one of them in the Old Law, who by a personall grace were of the New Law.* Just as the Fathers say, *David was a man in the Old, not of the old Testament.*

If Aristotle had grace, if he be the fore-runner of Christ, if he be placed in eternall happinesse, it is a question not unworthy these curious times, Whether they sinned most who prayed unto him; or Holcot, or the Philosophers cited by Holcot, who prayed for him.

And without just offence to Aristotles Lycæum, I hope I may say, though Jofrancus Offusius, that great Mathematician, in his preface to Maximilian, which is before his book *Of the divine power of starres*, saith, that Aristotle was *the High-priest of Philosophers*, yea * *an heavenly man*, saith Heinsius: others have deified him. Yet, there were divers Philosophers, from

* Cum conatu hominum.

Concludendo finaliter & cum veritate, dico, &c.

* ENS ENTIUM MISERERE MEI.

† *Ad solium æternæ beatitudinis.*

* *Præcursor Christi, in naturalibus, sicut Joannes Baptista fuit præcursor, ad præparandum ipsi plebem perfectam, in gratuitis & fuit unus eorum in Lege Veteri, qui per gratiam perfectum fuerunt de Lege Nova.*

* *Vir cœlestis.* Heins. Prolegom. in Nonnum.

Aristotles death till some hundreds of yeares after Christs time, who were in greater estimation among all the learned of those times, then ever Aristotle was; and perhaps there may be a farre perfecter body of Philosophie compiled from the dispersed tenents of other ancienter Philosophers, and more accordant to truth and Scriptures, then ever could be gathered from Peripateticall principles.

Theodoret in his fift book *De curandis Græcorum affectibus* (as some have it) or *De Græcarum affectionum curatione*, lib. 4. which some do intitle *De Natura*, hath these words; * *Aristotle hath impudently affirmed that the soul was corruptible, as much as Democritus and Epicurus.* Again, *Who be now the Presidents of the Stoicall sect, and who are the defenders of the doctrine of Aristotle the Stagirite? &c. And as for Plato, who made many speeches of the immortalitie of the soul, he could never perswade that assertion, no, not to Aristotle his own hearer.*

Concerning Plato, Augustine saith he was *most eagerly studious*; and Vives there addeth, that Justin Martyr, Eusebius, and Theodoret report, that Plato translated many things out of Hebrew books into his own. And Numenius, a Philosopher, said, * *What is Plato, but Moses atticizing, Moses the Athenian?*

Hierome Dialog. adversus Pelagianos lib. 1. bringeth in the Orthodoxal (though personated) Atticus against the feigned hereticall Critobulus, saying thus, * *I care not what Aristotle, but what Paul teacheth.* And on Eccles. 10. 15. *The labour of the foolish wearieth every one of them,* * *Reade*, saith he, *Plato, peruse the subtilties of Aristotle*; and, *That sexte is fulfilled upon them.* Though there he nibble at Plato, aswell as he biteth Aristotle, yet others have stiled him *The divine Plato.* And when Plato so often in his works saith thus, * *The ancients do affirm, It is in the old Oracles*, and the like, he points not at his master Socrates, or the preceding Pythagoras, but to those learned Sages and ancient Magi, who delivered these depths to the Egyptians, as they did to him.

Augustine thus, *Therefore I was willing to treat of this point with the Platonicks, because their books are better known. For both the Greeks, whose tongue excelleth among the Gentiles, have highly extolled them, and also the Latines; being moved hereunto, either by their excellency, or by their glory and renown, or by their sweetnesse, &c.* So much for the great esteem of Plato hath Augustine. Ludovicus Vives on this place addeth, that from the dayes of Plato and Aristotle till the reigne of Severus the Emperour, Aristotle was rather named then read or understood. Then arose Alexander Aphrodisæus, to expound Aristotle: yet Plato was more in request, * *untill Schools were publikely erected in France and Italy, that is, so long as the Greek and Latine tongue flourished.* Then falleth an heavy censure. * *After that science began*

* *Aristoteles animam corruptibilem esse impudenter asserit, aque ac Democritus & Epicurus.*

* *Quinam hodie inveniuntur Stoica secta præsidentes? quive etiam sunt qui Aristotelis Stagiritæ doctrinam corroborant? &c. At Plato quidem, qui complures sermones de animæ immortalitate disseruit, ut Aristoteli quidem, auditori suo, persuasit eam positionem.* Aug. de Civit. Dei lib. 8. cap. 11.

* Τί δὲ ἢ Πλάτων, ἢ Μωσῆς ἀττικίζων;

* *Neque enim mihi curæ est, quid Aristoteles, sed quid Paulus doceat.*

* *Lege Platonem, Aristotelis revolve versutias.*

* *Antiqui perhibent: In priscis habetur Oraculis.*

* *Ideo cum Platonicis placuit hanc causam agere, quia eorum sunt litteræ notiores. Nam & Græci, quorum lingua in Gentibus præeminet, eos magnâ prædicatione celebrarunt, & Latini; permoti eorum vel excellentiâ, vel gloriâ, vel gratiâ, &c.* Aug. De Civit. 8. 10.

* *Crebrior in manibus hominum & notior, usque ad Scholas in Gallia & Italia publicè constitutas, id est, quamdiu Græca & Latina lingua vigerunt.*

began to be theoretically, and with their profit, though to be able to deceive in disputing, and thirdly, to dash before the eyes by a kind of quaint dexterity and subtilty, which carried a pleasure, the Logick and Physick books of Aristotle seemed to have in them.

And now was Plato no more named, and though Vives confesseth he thinketh Aristotle not lesse learned then Plato, yet he calleth Plato *the most holy Philosopher*, nor can endure to have him neglected. And when Scaliger saith, * *They be slaves of small reading, which in divine things prefer Plato before Aristotle*, he speaketh partially, neglecting divine words of Plato then these cited out of Aristotle, and straining the words cited to a more celestiall sense then ever they were intended, as if Aristotle had a knowledge of the Trinitie, and apprehended it *above humane reach*, and therefore is by him stiled *the divine man*.

* *Postquam theatrico Peripatus ejus applausu omnisque eorum studio exsistimatus est, posse disputando fucum facere & eo obturare & pulverè ante oculos jacere, idque imperitissimis & peritis, & nonnullis ad libitum confictis, accommodatiores ad rem visi sunt libri Logici & Physici Aristotelis.* * *Multis paucula lassitudo, pluribus diutinus ante tulerunt Platonem Aristoteli.* Jul. Scal. Exercit. 365. sect. 3.

To Augustine saith, Plato and the Platonicks were so farre preferred before others, in the judgement of posterity, that when Aristotle, a man of excellent wit, and though not comparable to Plato for eloquence, yet surmounting many others, had set up the Peripatetick sect, and (even while his master lived) by his excellent fame *had gathered very many disciples unto his sect: yet the most noble later Philosophers, whom it pleased to follow Plato, would not be called Peripateticks or Academicks, but Platonicks.* Vives on this place of Augustine confesseth, that Aristotle was before Plato in varietie of knowledge, &c. above most, in wit and industry, above all, skilfull in arts; that the Greeks called Aristotle θειον, now both the same Greeks called Plato θειον, and the Latines DIVINUM. These things are ill observed by Vives. First, though Laërtius bringeth the saying of Plato, * *Aristotle hath kicked against us, as colts against their dames*; yet others deny that he taught publickly in Platoes life-time. Vives little remembreth, that the precedent words of S. Augustine may incline to the contrarie, besides other authorities, aswell as Laërtius. Secondly, that Augustine his term *haresis*, in the Greek, is but *secta* in the Latine; yet, by Vives his leave, S. Augustine could & would have said *Congregasset in suum Lycæum, in suam scholam, partem, sectam, disciplinam*, or any other such word, rather then *in suam haresim*, unlesse Augustine had intended to lay some aspersion upon Aristotle by the word of *haresis*, which is homonymous. Thirdly, Vives reporteth, without his authour, that Plato should say of his two disciples, Xenocrates and Aristotle, that the former needed the spurre, and Aristotle the bridle: whereas Cicero in his third book *De Oratore* ascribeth the saying to Isocrates, concerning two of his disciples, Theopompus and Ephorus; *Ephorus the dull, Theopompus the witty and apprehensive*: more distinctly, Suidas saith, it was spoken of Theopompus Chius, not Theopompus Gnidius. Again, Vives is mistaken in taxing

* *Plurimos discipulos in suam hæresin congregasset: tamen recentiores Philosophi nobilissimi, quibus Plato sectandus placuit, voluerunt se dici Peripateticos aut Academicos, sed Platonicos.* Aug. De Civitate Dei lib. 8. cap. 12.

* *Aristoteles in nos ut calcitravit, ut in matrem pulli.*

Plotinus for obscuritie, *lest he should degenerate from the customs of the sect*. Whereby he would insinuate, that either Plato was obscure, or Plotinus, an Aristotelian: when S. Augustine accounteth Plotinus among the famous Platonicks, in the same place; which Suidas also confirmeth. For Plotinus his disciples were the great Origen, and Porphyrius, and divers other famous Platonicks; and as all the Platonicks did Pythagorize, so did all the Fathers Platonize; and Plato was in that high esteem, that it was an ancient Proverb, *That if Jupiter would speak Greek, he would speak no otherwise then Plato.*

I return from the comparison of Plato with Aristotle, and from the oscitancy of Vives to the old matter.

Strong delusions rightly befall them, who make Philosophy equall to Divinity; and ascribe asmuch authoritie to Aristotle as to Moses or the Prophets, or to any Apostles or Evangelists, and who do answer their Texts with equall reverence. If they pray to them, or for them, let them see to it.

I proceed from the Philosophicall axiome, *That no Body compounded of contraries can perpetually endure* (which was spoken onely of the decayed estate, beyond which Philosophers could not aspire, and not of the state of integritie, which is our *Quære*; and I come to a passage of Divinitie tending that way. It is true, that Adam was made of earth, or rather *of the dust of the ground*, Genes. 2. 7. of the worst of the elements, and the worst part of it: *God framed man dust of the ground*, as it is there in the Original: *Not of the dust, or earth of Paradise, but of other earth, as it is in the Chaldee Targum*, saith Vives: of earth severed and distinct from that blessed garden. Cornelius à Lapide the Jesuit saith, *Drie dust was unfit for to be formed*; as if God could not work but like a potter, by fit and necessary materialls: and he citeth Tertullians words, *God by adding some fat liquour, cruddled it into slime and clay, as it were.* I say, though God had done so, yet he could have done otherwise; he could have made Man of water without earth, or of earth without water, or of any some-thing, or of nothing. I will confesse *de facto*, with Augustine, it was *wet dust*, because it is said, Genes. 2. 6. *There went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground*; (Augustine readeth it, *Fons ascendebat*: the Chaldee Paraphraze hath it, *Nubes*; but properly it is a vapour or a mist) and immediately, *The Lord formed Man*. Now it was of earth out of Paradise: for *the Lord took the Man*, (therefore he was before created) *and put him into the garden, to dresse it, and keep it*, Genes. 2. 15. (therefore he was out of it ere he was put into it) & after Adam sinned, *God sent Adam forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground*, or that ground, *from whence he was taken*, Genes. 3. 23. (therefore the ground from whence he was taken, was a different ground from Eden, from whence he was

Ad degenerare à more scholæ.

Jovem, Græce loqui si velles, non aliter locuturum quàm Plato scribit.

Vives in Aug. De Civit. 13. 24. *Pulvis aridus inidoneus erat ad plasmandum.*

Deus addito optimo liquore, in limum & quasi argillam coagulavit.

Pulvis humectus. Aug. De Civit. 13. 24.

he was expelled, and so Adam was not moulded or framed of the earth or dust of Paradise. All this being granted, I say, God could frame as lasting and as good a body, and as durable against the force of contrarieties, of the dust out of Paradise, as of the dust of the Garden. And questionles Adam was made of the earth before it was cursed, and why not then equall to the earth of Paradise? So that my Position is not yet shaken, *The contrarie disposition of the elements shall not forced dissolution, but Adam had an immortall body.* Which that you may the rather beleeve, let us confirm it by reason and authorities.

1. The first reason is this; Death commeth not but by outward violence, or inward distemper: In which regard, Death is divided by Aristotle into these two branches, *Violent, Naturall.* But Adam should not have been subject to eternall or internall force, or dyscrasie, if he had not sinned: Therefore he had a bodie that during innocency was immortall, and not subject to death. The Assumption is onely questionable. Concerning the former member of it, I evidence it thus: Before Man was created, the dominion over the Creatures was reserved for him, and fore-promised, Genes. 1. 26. so soon as he was created, the dominion was assigned over to him, verse. 28. And if no beast hurt Noah, or his familie in the Ark (though everie Creature imitated Adam, and rebelled against him their Lord, as he did against his Lord God) much lesse could they have hurt Adam persevering in innocencie? During which estate, the lambe and the wolf, the lion and the dragon would not have hurt one another: much lesse would they have hurt Man: least of all, would the issue of Adam have done him violence, or have said as the wicked in the Gospell, *This is the heir, let us kill him, and divide the inheritance,* Matt. 21. 38. For, then there had been no distinction of *Lord, Heir* and *Servant*, nor strife for inheritance.

Aristot. lib. de vita & morte.

It is too too true, that the higher bodies and the heavenly powers do now, besides their ordinarie influences, sometimes shed down among us their full and noxious qualities, the workers of sicknes and destruction; so that in divers Regions have been *Epidemical & popular diseases, as in the great conjunction of Planets foretold*, saith Ptolemeus, Alcabitius, with other Astronomers. But then the heavens should have dropped plentie, & poured down Health, and no bane-full qualitie could have descended from them. As for lightning and thunder, and the now-raging burning thunder-bolts, the armies of Gods wrath and messengers of death, either there should have been none (the place then needing no purifying) or at least not hurtfull or dangerous. Lastly, if Satan could have used outward violence, and destroyed Adam, or his posteritie that way, perhaps he would never

never have brought in Death by the back-doore of sinne, and never have undermined him by such hidden baits, and lurking temptations.

Likewise, inward distemper he had none, nor could have: and thus it appeareth,

There is a twofold temperature, { *Uniformis*, all humours being exactly in the same degree; *Difformis*, one humour ruling & prevailing over the rest.

The first may be called *temperamentum ad pondus*, which is *proportio arithmetica*, when all the foure qualities are equally weighed and tempered: so that there is no predominancie, no superioritie, nor can be; but all parts are equiponderall and even. The second is termed *temperamentum ad justitiam*, which is *Geometrica proportio*, when the foure qualities hang unevenly in the balance, yet fitted to the best service and use of the body. Whether of these two tempers was in Adam, I will not define; But if there were in his bodie *difforme temperamentum*, it was so perfect, yea equal in inequalitie, as was fit for such a bodie, as might be fit for such a soule: & such was the mixture of humours, by the divine hand of God compounding them, that both he and we should have lived, in the flower of youth, for ever, if Adam had not offended. What the bodilie constitution of the first Adam was, may be thought to be the same or the like of the second Adam: to whom the Psalmist singeth, Psal. 45. 2. *Pulchrisſi pre filijs hominum, Thou art fairer then the children of men: Perfectè pulchrisſi*, as Marabine rendereth it: which can not be so properly understood of Solomon, as of Christ: who not only superabounded in all vertues, (and *vertue is fairer then the morning-starre*, saith Aristotle) but also in all comely proportion, and bodilie beautie. *Then the children of men: why not then the Angels? What means he by saying, Then the children of men, but because he took man?* as S. Augustine on the place reasoneth most acutely; inferring, that not Christs divinitie, but even his humane nature is in this place commended for beautie. Though the Prophet saith of him, Esai. 53. 2. *He had no forme nor comelinesse*, yet he speaketh it in the person of the Jews, *and as they thought*, saith Hierome on the place: Or, he had no comelines in his own apprehension, as Christ himself in great humilitie might undervalue his own worth. Thirdly, I may expound all passages seeming to vilifie Christs bodily shape, onely comparatively, with reference unto his divinitie; thus the bodily beautie of Christ is not to be nam'd, or vo'st and incomparison with the Deitie. Fourthly, and most properly, in my opinion, Esai describeth Christ as he was to be in his Agonie and Passion; his body rent and torn with rods, so ruefully, that David in the first and literal sense (if not in that sense onely) compareth the tor-

men

* *Præ filiis hominum; quare & non præ Angelis? quid voluit dicere præ filiis hominum, nisi quia homo?*

mentors to flowers, and the dints, impressions, and the bruised bloudy concavities and flices, to our eyes. *The plowers plowed upon my back and made long furrows*: his face spit upon, his temples gored and bleeding by the Crown of thorns, which was not onely platted on his head, but fastned in it by the beating with canes; his body black and blew by their striking; his hands and feet digged throughout with great nails, that I may use the metaphor of the Psalmist, rather digged, *foderunt*, then pierced, to shew the latitancie of his wounds; his side so rent a sunder, so broad and wide, that Thomas thrust his hand into it. Take Christ, as bearing our griefs, as wounded for our transgressions, as bruised for our sinnes, as weltered in his streaming blood, I will say as Esai said of him, or as the Psalmographist, *I am a worm, and no man, a reproach of men, and despised of the people*, Psal. 22. 6.

But consider him before his Passion. *There shined some starrie thing in his face*, saith S. Hierome, *and his whole body was beautifull, because formed by the power of the holy Ghost*; *in whose work there can be no error nor defect*, saith Lyranus. *Thou art fairer then the children of Adam* (so bid is in the Originall) Augustine, Cassiodorus on the place; and Chrysostome, Homil. 19. on Matth. expound it of Christs corporall feature. I think I may say, if Christ exceeded not Adam, yet he was equall to him. The first Adam was made out of virginall dust, the second out of virginal flesh and bloud, both of them being framed by the miraculous hand of God; but miracles do more exceed naturalls, then naturalls do artificialls. *What is thy beloved more then another beloved, O thou fairest among women?* say the daughters of Jerusalem to the Church their Mother, Cant. 5. 9. She answereth in the next verse, *My beloved is white and ruddy, a goodly person* (as the Bishops Bible readeth it) or as the late Translation hath it, *the chiefest among ten thousand*. Whether beautie be to be defined *Aptnesse of parts with some pleasantnesse of colour*, as S. Augustine speaketh, or *a convenient medly of white and red especially*, as from this place may seem probable; certain it is, Christ wanted no comelinesse, nor beautie; though he had no womanish or effeminate shape, but *such as was most befitting a man*, saith Gregorie de Valentia. *Thou art beautifull, O my love, as Thirzah, comely as Jerusalem*, Cant. 6. 4. and, *Thou art all fair, there is no spot in thee*, Cant. 4. 7. In which regard, perhaps, it was, that though the humours of Christs body did increase with the increase of his bodie, and grew up from infancie to puerilitie, from it to juvenilitie, thence to virilitie; yet there was so harmonious a proportion and so due weight, yet of justice, that we read not any one part of Christs bodie to have been out of tune, excepting in his agonie and Passion, when his very bones were out of joint: nor is he recorded to

have

*In ejus facie fidei rubor quiddam illuxit. Totum ejus corpus fuit speciosum, quia formatum virtute Spiritus Sancti, in cujus opere non potest esse error aut defectus. Lyran. in Ps. 45.

*Partium compositio cum quadam coloris suavitate. Aug. De Civit. 22. 19.

Tom 4. Disput. 1. quæst. 14. punct. 2.

Non suscepit infirmitates individui, sed speciei.

have been sick at any time; nor so much as inclining to sickness all his life. He took not upon him the infirmities of particular men, but of mankinde: as to be weary, to mourn, to weep, to be hungry, thirstie, to suffer, to die. As for sinne and diseases flowing from sinne; he was subject to none; nor to personall defects; but onely to the generall defects of humane bodies. Indeed it is said, Esai 53. 4. *Surely he took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses*: but Basil expounds it thus, *He bare our sicknesses; not that he did transferre them upon himself, but because he healed those that were sick*. Where he seemes to remove all sickness from Christ.

ἐκ τοῦ· ἵνα λάβῃ τὰς ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ τοῦ τὰς θεραπεύσαι. Bas. in Regulis brevioribus quæst. 177.

Besides Adam his excellent tempet; consider his food; he had all the trees of the garden for meat, except the forbidden one. The healthie waters about Paradise he had for drink: Wholsome things he knew from hurtfull (if any hurtfull things were:) His giving them names doth prove, that he was acquainted with their natures. As for taking too much or too little, it could not be, whilest his soul was innocent and spotlesse. For he had originall justice, which in the use of lawfull meats should subject his senses and his appetite unto reason. As for clothing, he needed it not: Innocency apparelled him, till he put off the robe of righteousnes, and so it should have continued. Lastly, as Adam in Paradise had a deep sleep which fell upon him, Genes. 2. 21. which, I confesse, was extraordinarie, so Augustine, Tertullian, and the School after them, do yeeld, that ordinarie sleep was not excluded out of Paradise; but in the night he was allowed sleep. So that Adam enjoying all things necessarie, delightfull, or convenient, which concerned his bodie, we may safely conclude the first reason, That since neither outward force, nor inward distemper could befall Adams body; if he had continued in innocencie, his body should never have tasted of death, and so was, and so should have been immortall. And this will yet more plainly appeare, if we will weigh the reasons following.

Aug. De Civ. t. 14. 16. Tertul. De Anima. cap. 24.

4. Among the trees of the garden there was the tree of life, which Adam had libertie freely to eat of.

Some think it was appointed as a means to translate Adam to immortalitie without sicknes or death. Others say, it would hinder the losse of naturall heat and radicall moisture: whereby though yeares or age, yet weaknes, or decrepitnes should not come nigh him. Others say, that it being once tasted, should bring perfect immortalitie, even such immortalitie as we shall have after the Resurrection. See Bellarmine *de Gratia primi hominis*, cap. 18. and Mr. Salkeld in his Treatise *of Paradise*, wherein some whole Chapters he hath laboriously collected, and copiously explained the various opinions concerning the tree of life. Take my gleanings after their full vintage, and taste what I have gathered.

Though

Though Lumbard, Sent. 2. Dist. 29. dub. 8. queſtioneth, Whether Adam before his ſinne did eat of the tree of life, and out of Auguſtine concludeth there, That they did eat as it was commanded, that they ſhould eat of every tree, ſave one; yet I can no way agree with him. This his error is grounded upon an other, which he hath cited Diſtinct. 19. of the ſame book, in the letters B and C, That Adam was commanded to eat of the tree of life, and that he ſhould have lived, if he had not ſinned it. For firſt, It was not a command, but a permiſſion. God gave the uſe of the tree no otherwiſe to man, Geneſ. 1. 29. then to the beaſts and fowls the green herbs, verſe 30. but this was by way of indulgence, not of command. Secondly, Geneſ. 2. 16. *Of every tree of the garden thou may ſt freely eat.* And though it be in the Hebrew, *Eating thou ſhalt eat*, yet it implieth no abſolute precept. Thirdly, Geneſ. 3. 2. the woman ſaith, *We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden*; ſhe ſaith not, *We muſt eat*, or *We are charged*; much leſſe, *preſently, ſo ſoon as we ſee them*, or *before we do other things*. Fourthly, Geneſ. 9. 3. *Every moving thing that liveth ſhall be meat for you, even as the green herb have I given you all things.* Are we commanded to eat every beaſt, and every herb? then whoſoever forbeareth any one, ſinneth. Or was there in this a difference between the grant unto Adam, and the grant unto Noah, and their poſterities?

The ſecond errour is of Lumbard, That Adam did eat of the tree of life. His proof out of Auguſtine falleth ſhort, even as it is cited, though the place is miſtaken by him, and the words maym'd. Indeed Auguſtine thus. * *Certainly it is well thought, that our firſt parents, before that malicious perſuaſion, did abſtain from the forbidden food, and uſed ſuch things as were granted them, and conſequently the reſt, ſpecially the tree of life.* * Note firſt, He ſaith *granted*, not *commanded*: as Noah ate not of every thing granted to him, yet Noah ſpent many hundred yeares more time after the Floud, then Adam did in Paradiſe. Neither can I think Adam in that eſtate ſo addicted to his belly, that he in ſo ſhort a time would eat of ſo many, of all, and every tree. Secondly, Rupertus ſaith, *The eating of the tree of life but once, had made them live for ever.* Auguſtine moreover addeth, *It is no where read in Geneſis, that Adam in Paradiſe did not eat of the fruit of the tree of life*, of which place by and by. Now as Auguſtine is directly againſt me in the ſecond point, he is as directly againſt them in the firſt point: * *They had received power to eat of every fruit that was in Paradiſe.* To ſtrengthen their ſide, Auguſtine annexeth this reaſon, *What is more abſurd then to believe that he would eat of other trees, and not of that?* ſaith Auguſtine. I anſwer, perchance Adam thought that he had no need of that tree, as yet, as knowing both that he ſhould not die, if he did not ſinne, and that the time of his tranſlation was not come. Nor did thoſe

* *Recte profectò intelliguntur primi homines, ante malignam perſuaſionem, abſtinuiſſe à cibo vetito, atque uſi fuiſſe conceſſi; ac per hoc, & cæteris, & præcipuè ligno vitæ.* De peccat. Meritis & Remiſ. 2. 21.

Rup. in Geneſ. l. 3. cap. 30.

Aug. Cont. Adverſar. Legis & Prophet. l. 15

* *Utenti ad eſcam omni ligno, quod in Paradiſo erat, acceperat poteſtatem.* Ibidem.

*Gustus arboris vitæ corruptionem corporis inhibebat.
*Vita arbor, medicinæ modo, corruptionem omnem prohibebat.

those of the like thoughts savour of sinne, or ignorance. Augustine to this point is indifferent to himself, saying, *The tree of life was a tree of life indeed. The corruption of the body.* Again, *To the tree of life, by way of physick, did prevent all corruption.* But, saith I, if corruption seised not on Adam, till he sinned, what needed Adam to eat, till he sinned, of this Medicine? since the sick have need of physicians and not the whole. If Adam had eaten of the tree of life before he had eaten the forbidden fruit, God would have kept him from the forbidden fruit, as after he kept him from the tree of life: or else the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good & evill had not caused destruction, the apple had not been deadly, but Adam should have lived immortally. This will not seem strange, if you weigh what followeth.

If after Adam had sinned, he had taken of the tree of life, and eaten the fruit, he had lived for ever, Genes. 3. 22. fo els, what needed God to have placed such a watch and ward against him? Again, if Adam might have lived everlastingly, for all Gods threat, yea though he had now a dead body, when God debard him from the tree of life, if he had but eaten of it, he should also have lived for ever, if he had eaten of it before he sinned. But, saith Augustine, *After sinne Adam might have remained indissoluble, if God had given him leave to eat of the tree of life.* The conclusion reacheth home against Augustine, That Adam ate not of the tree of life, before he ate of the forbidden fruit. I think the malice of Satan egged Adam on to taste first of the unlawfull fruit, the usher of death, though the tree of life stood next unto it (for both the tree of life was in the midst of the garden, Genes. 2. 9. and the tree of knowledge of good and evill was also in the midst of the garden, as appeareth in the same place, and more plainly Genes. 3. 3.) If any be so curious, as to enquire what was the form and figure of the garden of Eden, when two trees are just in the midst of it; I answer, We must not take the word *midst* strictly or Mathematically, but at large, or Rhetorically. When the Shunamite said, *In medio populi ego habitans sum*, it is well rendred by our late Translatours, *I dwell among mine own people*; not as if the words inforced, that she dwelt exactly in the midst of them. The like Hebraism is used by Abraham, Genes. 18. 24. *Si forte fuerint quinquaginta justi in medio civitatis*, that is, *Fifty righteous within the citie*; not as if all the fifty dwelt together in the exact middle of the citie. David also useth the like phrase, Psal. 102. 24. *Take me not away in the midst of my dayes*: in which place, as well as in the propounded difficultie, we must not be too strict or rigorous upon the letter. The like is in Esay 5. 8.

*Post peccatum, Adam potuit indissolubilis manere si à Domino permissum illi esset edere de arbore vitæ. Aug. lib. quæst. Vet. & Novi Testam. c. 19. Tom. 4.

2. Kings 4. 13.

The last touch we will give at this point is thus; God turned Adam and Eve out of Paradise, and by Cherubims and a sword kept away the tree of life; so that neither Adam, nor his poste-

ritie

ritie should be able to approach it. And perhaps the Cherubims were purposely placed to confront Satan and his evill Angels, lest they might bring to Adam and Eve, or to their posteritie, the fruit of the tree of life: for if we had been immortally miserable & cursed, as Satan himself is, was as much as he desired. So great a vertue had the tree of life, if once it had been eaten.

Let me adde in the third place, If Adam had not sinned at all, nor at all eaten of the tree of life, yet he had not died: for death was appointed for sinne and for nothing els. Bonaventure saith, * *It is impossible that innocencie and the punishment of corruption should stand together.*

* *Impossibile est ut simul consistat innocentia & corruptionis pœna.* Bonav. in 2. Sent. dist. 19. art. 2.

But to what use was then the tree of life? The question was made of old by an adversarie to the Law and the Prophets: * *That tree which bare fruit of life in Paradise, to whom was it profitable?* I confesse Augustine answereth, *To whom but first unto our first Parents, the man and the woman placed in Paradise?* But that is the point to be proved. Again, Augustine there saith, *Enoch and Elias eat of that tree, but* (saith he) *we must not hastily say that any other eateth of it:* but how unlikely are these things? The adversarie of the Law and the Prophets might better have been answered, That there was no more use of that tree, then of others which were untasted (for no man can think, that they tasted of every one in so short a time.) Or what inconvenience ariseth if we say, A profered curtesy not accepted came to nothing? What can the adversarie conclude from thence? for God profereth salvation and the means thereof to many, who do not accept of it, the fault being on Mans part, and not on Gods.

* *Ista arbor quæ in Paradiso fructus vitæ ferebat, cui proderat?*

To finish this point, I resolve, There was no use made of the tree of life, as it fell out. If it be further questioned, What might have been the use thereof? I answer, That the exact specialties can not punctually be known. Probable it is, that the tree of life might have conferred much to the existence of life, though not to the essence. Adam should have lived how soever, and that immortally, if he had not transgressed Gods commandement: the tree of life might have been conducible to his better being, yea to his best being: by it he might have been changed from his terrestriall not-dying estate, or immortall life, to a celestiall; and not onely an immortall, but an unchangeable eternall life. In which regard, perchance, the tree of life is stiled Genes. 3.22. *The tree* עצ חיים *hachajim, of lives,* as profitable (if tasted) both to Adams present life, which was in time to have its *consummantem finem*, though not *consumentem*; its end, though not its death; and also to his future and more happie life, which should never have end. I summe up all with Augustines words, * *There was meat, lest Adam should hunger; drink, lest he should thirst; a tree of life, lest old age should dissolve him: no inward disease, no outward blow was feared.*

* *Cibus edebat, ne Adam esuriret; potus, ne sitiret; lignum vitæ, ne illum senectus dissolveret: nullus infirmitatis morbus, nullum ictus metuebatur extrinsecus.* De Civit. 14. 20.

A new

A new Quære may be made, Whether if Adam after his sin had eaten of the tree life, his posteritie as well as himself had lived for ever? My answer setteth on the negative; because Adams action had been personall, not representative or ideall; and his posteritie was neither to answer for his second sinne, or after-offences, nor to have received any benefit by his good deeds succeeding his fall: but he stood alone for us, and we were in him onely as he had power to keep or break the first commandement.

And now am I come to the second Topick place, by which I undertook to prove that Adams body had been immortall, if he had not sinned, and that is Authoritie.

5. Not S. Augustine alone, but a whole Councell where he was present, towit the Milevitan Councell, is strong on our side. *Whosoever shall say that the first man Adam was made mortall, so that whether he had sinned or no, he should have died in body, that is, gone out of the body; not for the desert of sinne, but by the necessitie of nature; let him be accursed.* And this curse fell heavy upon the Pelagians, who did think that Adam should have died, though he had not sinned: for so they held, saith* Augustine. Cajetan thus:* *In the state of innocencie Adam had a corruptible body, in regard of the flux of naturall moisture, but not mortall.* Richeomus a Jesuit saith,* *If man was created mortall, those threatnings whereby God did denounce death unto him, were unprofitable; for Adam might have answered, I know well enough that I shall die, although I neither taste nor touch the tree of knowledge of good & evill.* And again; *God in the production of every one of his works, kept an exact and most beautifull symmetry between the matter and the form, the body and the soul, and such a symmetrie as was most fit and accommodate to* obtain the end of everie creature, furnishing the matter with qualities and instruments most apt and pliable to serve the vertues and faculties of the form. Therefore the soul of man being immortall, and the faculties and operations proportioned to the essence, the body also then must needs be immortall.* Item, *In every good marriage two things are observed at least; the qualities of the parties, and their age. Therefore unto the soul, which is free from the tyranny of death, God married the body, which was free also from the grave-clothes and bands of death. Death is the brood of sinne,* saith Julianus Pomerius; *& Adam was so created,* that having discharged his duty of obedience, without the intervention of death he should have been followed of Angelicall immortality and blessed eternity.* He had immortalitie, yet changeable; not Angelicall and eternall. As I began with S. Augustine, so with him will I end: *It is a constat among Christians holding the Catholick Faith,* that even the death of the body hath been inflicted upon us, not by the law of nature, but by the desert of sinne.* Otherwhere he saith, * *Sinne is the father of death.* Again,* *If Adam had not sinned, he was not to be stripped of his*

* *Quicunque dixerit Adam primum hominem mortalem factum, ita ut sive peccaret, sive non peccaret, moreretur in corpore, hoc est, de corpore exiret; non peccati merito, sed necessitate naturæ; Anathema sit.* Lib. de Hæresibus cap. 88.

* In 1. Cor. 15. 53.

* *In statu innocentiæ Adam corpus habebat corruptibile, quantum ad fluxum humidi naturalis, sed non mortale.*

* *Si homo mortalis creatus fuit, inutiles erant illæ minæ, quibus Deus mortem illi intendebat; poterat namq; respondere,* &c. In Valedictione animæ devotæ, Colloq. 32.

* Colloq. 34.

* *Ad cujusque creaturæ finem consequendum.*

* Colloq. 35.

* *Ut perfunctus obedientiæ munere, sine interventu mortis Angelica eum immortalitas, & æternitas sequeretur beata.*

* *Etiam ipsam nobis corporis mortem, non lege naturæ, sed merito inflictam esse peccati.* De Civit. Dei. 13. 15.

* *Peccatum est pater mortis.*

of his body, but clothed upon with immortalitie, that mortalitie might be ſwallowed up of life, that is, that he might paſſe from a naturall to a ſpiritual eſtate, from an earthly to an heavenly, from a mortal to an immortall, as I truly interpret his meaning. For he taketh not *Mortall* for that which muſt die. And Again, * *It was not to be feared, if Adam had lived longer, that he ſhould have been troubled with age, or death: For if God was ſo gracious to the Iſraëlites, that for fourty yeares their clothes waxed not old upon them, nor their ſhoes waxed old upon their feet, Deuter. 29. 5. what marvell were it, if God granted to obedient Adam, * that having a naturall and mortall body he ſhould have in it ſome ſtate and condition, that he might be old without imperfection, and at what time it pleaſed God, he ſhould come from mortalitie to immortalitie, * without paſſing through death?* Where though S. Auguſtine ſeems to ſay, Adam had a mortall body, and ſhould have paſſed from mortalitie, yet he taketh *Mortale* for all one with *Animale*, and oppoſeth it to *Spirituale*. So that I confeſſe, Adam in Paradiſe had not a ſpirituall body, not ſuch a bodie as he and we ſhall have after the Reſurrection. And thus the body which he had, may be called *Animale* or *Mortale*: and yet S. Auguſtine with us, and we with him, acknowledge this truth, that the body of Adam could not have died, if he had not ſinned: and in that regard Adams body may be juſtly termed *immortall*, not with reference to that heavenly and ſpirituall bodie which he ſhall have hereafter; but *immortall* therefore, becauſe (except for ſinne) his body (as it was) was free from death. And the ſame Auguſtine hath a whole Chapter intituled thus, * *Againſt the doctrines of thoſe that believe not, that the firſt men had been immortall, if they had not ſinned.*

Among ſuch a troup, may I put in ſomewhat unthought of by others? Some have ſaid truly, that the divine providence, and preſerving power, which extendeth to the leaſt things in our declined eſtate, as to the lives of birds and beaſts and the fall of every hair (God not being * *leſſe in the leaſt things, then* he was *in the greateſt*, and governing *all things in number, weight, and meaſure*) would have much more watcht over Adam and his offſpring, continuing perfect. But this is that which I propoſe, Whether the good Angels did immediatly miniſter unto Adam in his integritie, and ſhould have done unto us, to keep mankinde from harm? To which I anſwer, That ſince the Prophet, Pſal. 91. 11. deſcribing the bleſſed eſtate of the godly, maketh this one eſpeciall branch, *He ſhall give his Angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy wayes*; and verſe 12. *They ſhall bear thee up in their hands, leſt thou daſh thy foot againſt a ſtone*: I can not but think that the ſame Angels ſhould have watcht over us, and friendly converſed with us in our innocencie. For God reduceth * *the loweſt things to the higheſt by the middle*, working by ſubordination of cauſes. Yea, grant that this is ſpoken of the

* *Si non peccâſſet Adam non erat expoliandus corpore, ſed ſuperveſtiendus immortalitate, ut abſorberetur mortale à vita, id eſt, ab animali ad ſpirituale tranſiret, à terreno ad cæleſte, à mortali ad immortale.* De peccat. Merit. & Remiſ. l. 1. cap. 2.

* Ibid. cap. 3.

* *Vt animale ac mortale habens corpus, haberet in eo quendam ſtatum.*

* *Sine media morte?*

* *Contrà eorum dogmata, qui primos homines, ſi non peccâſſent, immortales futuros fuiſſe non credunt.* De Civit. 13. 19.

* *Deus non minor eſt in minimis quàm in maximis.*

* *Infima ad ſuprema per media.*

Sonne of God onely, (which by the Evangeliſts Matt. 4.6. and Luke 4.9. ſeemeth to be the Devils argute inference) yet it excludes not their watching over us, and their miniſterie (if we had not fallen) whoſe very office and name conſiſt in being *miniſtring Spirits: All being ſent forth to miniſter for them who ſhall be heirs of ſalvation*, Heb. 1. 14. which out of doubt both Adam and his iſſue, continuing in perfection, ſhould have been. But leaving theſe things, Chriſts anſwer to Satan proves, that unto whom theſe words were ſaid, *He ſhall give his Angels charge over thee*, &c. unto the ſame was alſo ſaid; *Thou ſhalt not tempt the Lord thy God*, Matt. 4. 7. which was not ſpoken to Chriſt alone or principally, but in the plurall number to the Iſraëlites and others ſucceeding them, as appeareth Deuter. 6. 16. *Ye ſhall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Maſſah.* They are deceived, whoſoever imagine the miniſterie of Angels ſhould not have been any way neceſſarie, if Adam had not ſinned; ſince Chriſt (the immaculate Lambe of God, who ſinned not, nor could ſinne) refuſed not their miniſterie, Matth. 4. 11. and comfort or ſtrength, Luke 22. 43; and ſince one Angel ſtrengthneth himſelf with an other, Dan. 10. 21. and Revel. 12. 7; and ſince they might have miniſtred more matter of joy unto us, by their moſt familiar converſation in aſſumed bodies.

Unto theſe authorities let me adde two memorable places out of the Apocrypha. The firſt is, Wiſd. 1. 13. *God made not death*: Satan begot it, ſinne brought it forth, Adam and Eve nurſt it. The other paſſage is in Wiſd. 2. 23. *God created man ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ, to be immortall, & made him an image of his own eternity.* On which words Holcot thus, *Corporeall creatures have onely a footſtep of God: Man is the image of God.* Again,* *On Gods part, he created him unperiſhable according to the body.* And there he hath a large diſcourſe, proving, howſoever Ariſtotle (Metaph. 8.) defineth Man to be *a reaſonable creature mortall*, that the oppoſite is true, and he reſteth in it. For Ariſtotle knew not Adams innocencie, but ſpake of us as we are in the ſtate of ſin. Whoſoever deſireth to read more curioſities ſtrange and learned, concerning the bodily immortalitie of Adam, at the Creation, let him read Eſtius on the ſecond of the Sent. Diſtinct. 19.

*Quantum fuit ex parte Dei, creavit hominem inexterminabilem ſecundum corpus.

But to confirm the truth delivered in the book of Wiſdome, the laſt and the beſt kinde of authoritie ſhall be produced out of the unqueſtionable Canon: death is ſtiled our *Enemy*, 1. Corinth. 15. 26. ἐχθρὸς, *inimicus*, as Hierome on the 27. of Eſai readeth it: *hoſtis*, ſaith Valla: therefore death is not naturall or kindly to us, but rather a conſort, and fellow-ſouldier of Satan and ſinne, who fight againſt us. But the ſharp-pointed places are in Geneſ. 2. 17. *In the day that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die*; or, *dying thou ſhalt die. Mortalis eris*, as Symmachus well tranſlates it; or *morti obnoxius*, as Auguſtine well expounds it: and Geneſ. 3. 3

Te

Ye shall not touch it, lest ye die: therefore they should not have died, if they had not touched the forbidden fruit. And so they both were, and ever might have been immortall.

When the woman of Sarepta said to Elijah,* *Art thou come unto me to call my sinne to remembrance, and to slay my sonne?* doth she not secretly intimate, that sinne is a murtherer? And if there had been no sinne, there had also been no death, in and by her evident confession that her sinne was the cause of his death. Scotus shall determine the point; *Punishment cannot be without fault: but death is the punishment of sinne, and during the state of innocency there could be no sinne: therefore no death.*

I have dwelt the longer on this part, because every reason & authoritie by which I have proved, that Adams bodilie estate in the time of innocency was immortall, affordeth also, by way of preparative, a binding argument, to evince that Adam for sin was appointed to die; which is the first of the two Propositions which I propounded. In which words we intend to handle these things: First, somewhat concerning death; Secondlie, that Adam was appointed to die for one sinne onely; Thirdly, that it was for Adams own sinne onely, and not for Eves; Fourthly, we will enquire what that sinne was.

*1. Kings 17.18.

†In 2. Sent. dist. 19. quæst. 1.

O Onely-wise God, who created st Man in thine own likenes, and mad st him the Image of thine own eternitie: I beseech thee, to renew in me that decaied Image; make me like unto thee: give me the favour to taste of the Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God; and to drink of the pure River of the Water of Life, clear as Crystall, proceeding out of the Throne of God, and of the LAMBE. Heare me, O blessed SAVIOUR, for thine infinite Merit, and mercies sake. Amen.

CHAP. III.

1. Death is a bitter-sweet. Enoch and Elias Raptures were not painfull to them. Christs Transfiguration, and the manner of it. That it was not painfull to him. Adams translation to a life celestiall and a body spirituall, should not have been painfull, if he had not sinned. They who shall be changed at Christs coming, shall by it finde no pain. Death is painfull.

2. Man-kinde died the first minute of their sinne. God draweth good out of evill. Death in some regard is changed, from a punishment to be a favour and blessing of God.

3. Not many or more sinnes, but one caused death. One onely. David begotten in lawfull wedlock. That this one sinne is not lesse in the godly, nor greater in the wicked. Death was appointed for one sinne onely, of one person onely.

4. This one person onely was Man: this Man that sinned that one sinne, was Adam. Strange and curious speculations, that Eve sinned not that sinne for which man-kinde was appointed to death.

5. Two Schoole-speculations propounded. The second handled at large, as expounding the former, and determined against the Schoolmen themselves, viz. That the children of innocent Adam had been born confirm'd in grace. *The censure of Vives upon these and the like points. A part of his censure censured.*

1. Concerning Death, I mean in this place to touch onely the strange medly of { Sower. / Sweet. } that is mixed in it, of

The sowernes or bitternes of death is discerned, because that manner of secession or departure is onely painfull; whereas all other approaches unto glorie, all other stairs, steps, and means, inducing to blessednes, are void of pain.

Let us see it exemplified in Enoch, *He walked with God, and was not, for God took him.* Genes. 5. 24. His manner of not-being, as he was before (whatsoever it were, or howsoever) was never held painfull. Secondly, the chariot of fire, and the horses of fire, which parted Eliah and Elisha both asunder, 2. Kings 2. 11,

hurt

hurt neither of them: *Elijah* (saith the place) *went up by a whirlwinde into heaven*; the very form of words implying a willing easie ascent: nor did the whirlwinde molest him, or pain him; though Ecclesiasticus 48. 9. it is said, it was *a whirlwinde of fire.*

Christs Transfiguration comes next to be considered. It was a true representation of that bodilie glorie, which at the recollection & retribution of all Saints, God will adorn and cloth the faithfull withall: Christ shewing them the mark at which they ought to shoot: for we also are to be *fashioned* or configured to his transfiguration, Philip. 3. 21. * *As he is to be at the time of judging, such did he appeare to the Apostles*, saith Hierom on Matth. 17. *And let not man think he lost his old form and face*, saith he, *or took a body spirituall or aëriall: the splendor of his face was seen, and the whitenes of his vestments described.* * *The substance is not taken away, but the glory is changed.* Or that I may utter it in Theophylacts words on Mark 9. 2. *By the transfiguration* (so Oecolampadius should translate it) *understand not the change of character and lineaments, but the character remaining such as it was before, an increase was made of unspeakable light. This admirable light not coming from without to him as it did to Moses, but flowing from his divinitie into his humane soul, from it into his body, and from it into his very clothes; will you say his clothes were changed*; saith S. Hierom: *His raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow: so as no fuller on earth can white them*, Mark. 9. 3. *And his face did shine as the Sunne*, Matth. 17. 2.

What S. Chrysostom saith of the spirituall bodies of the Saints, I will much more rather say of Christs body transfigured (for if starre differeth from starre in glorie, man from man, much more shall Christ shine above all other men, by infinite degrees) *They shall shine as the Sunne: not because they shall not exceed the splendor of the sunne, but because we see nothing more bright then the sunne, he took the comparison thence. And this shining*, saith Aquinas, * *was essentially a claritie of glory, though not in the manner, seeing it was by way of a transient passion, as the aire is inlightned of the sunne: whereas* * *to a glorified body claritie from the soul doth accrue, as some permanent qualitie.* Which essentiall claritie Christ had from his nativitie, yea from his first conception, yet by dispensation he eclipsed it ever till he had accomplished our redemption, except at this time, when appeared a brightnes of glory, though not a brightnes of a glorious body, not imaginary (unlesse you take imaginary as synonymall with representative) but reall, though transitorie.

Can any one think that herein was any pain, or rather not infinite pleasure? The beholders rejoyced: they could not do so at the pain of Christ. If there were any pain or grief, it would rather have been so at the withdrawing of his unusuall claritie:

* *Qualis futurus est tempore judicandi, talis Apostolis apparuit.*

* *Non substantia tollitur, sed gloria commutatur.*

Aquin. part 3. q. 45. art. 2.

* *Fuit gloriæ claritas essentialiter, licèt non secundum modum, cum fuerit per modum transeuntis passionis.*

* *Ad corpus glorificatum redundat claritas ab anima, sicut qualitas quædam permanens.*

tie: which not being likely, the manifestation of this claritie, at this transfiguration, was lesse likely to be painfull.

The fourth and last kinde of degree to happines, is translation; not onely as Enoch was translated, from one life to an other kinde of life, but such a translation as should have been of Adam, if he had not sinned, and shall be of such as shall be alive at Christs coming. Adams translation had been *sine media morte*. Nor was his slumber painfull, nor *solutio continui* at the drawing out of his rib, nor the closing of the flesh again: nor is it likely there was in Adams side any scar, the badge of pain and sorrow: much lesse should he have had pain at his translation. Pain is the grand-child of sinne, the daughter of punishment; from both which the estate of innocency was priviledged. *Every thing* in the Creation *was very good*, Genes. 1. 31: *Every tree was pleasant to the sight, and good for food*, Genes. 2. 9; and could the tree of life cause pain? By tasting the fruit thereof, Adam and his offspring had come to an higher and more unchangeable happines. The middesse was then proportionate to the beginning, and to the end. Sorrow was part of the curse: innocency could not feel pain, much lesse shall eternall happines; and should the tree of life have caused pain? Then were there little difference between it, and the tree of knowledge of good and evill. Or what difference in that point would there be between Adams death, which was painfull, and his translation, if it should have been painfull? As concerning the translation of them that shall be found alive at the last day, I am thus conceited: That there shall be no true, and totall separation of their souls from their bodies; at least, so much as concerneth the righteous: That they shall be changed: That they shall put on immortalitie. If it be delightfull now to our bodies to receive ease, shall it be painfull to be clothed with incorruptibility? It shall be done in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye: *Nolumus expoliari*, saith the Apostle, shewing the unwillingnes of men to die, *sed supervestiri desideramus* or *volumus*; for so must the Apostle be interpreted, as appeareth vers. 2, *We grone earnestly, desiring to be clothed upon*. Tertullian saith, **Who desireth not, being yet in the flesh, to be clothed upon with immortalitie, and to continue his life gained by a substituted denunciation of death?* Can so blessed a change be painfull? or can we naturally desire pain? shall we grone, and grone earnestly, that we may have pain? Hierome, in his Epistle to Minervius and Alexander, saith thus of the word *Rapiemur*: ** I think that this word sheweth a sudden passage to a better place, and that he said he was caught up, to signifie that his passing was swifter then his thinking*; not as if it were painfull to be taken, as I imagine. S. Paul speaketh of this translation and change, as a matter worthie of thanks unto God, 1. Corinth. 15. 51, &c. Onely death, of all other wayes by which God useth to call mankinde

to

2. Cor. 5. 4.

*Quisnam desiderat, adhuc in carne, superinduere immortalitatem, & continuare vitam lucrifactam mortis vicariâ denuntiatione? De Resur. carnis.

*Hoc verbo ostendi puto subitum ad meliora transcensum, & idcirco raptum se voluisse dicere, ut velocitas transeuntis sensum cogitantis excederet.

to glorie, death onely is painfull. Psal. 116. 3. *The sorrows of death compassed me. God loosed the pains of death*, Act. 2. 24. and Hebr. 2. 15. *Some through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage.* And indeed this pain of death is part of the curse denounced. But of this point, more hereafter. And thus do I make my approach towards it.

2.* Augustine saith, *When disobedient Adam sinned, that did his body lose the grace of being obedient to his soul. Then arose that bestiall motion, to be ashamed of by men, which he blusht at in his nakednes. Then also, by a certain sickness taken by a sudden and contagious corruption, it came to passe that the stabilitie of age being lost, in which they were created, by the changes of ages they made a progresse to death. For though they lived many yeares after, yet they began to die the same day when they received the law of death, by which they were to grow old. For whatsoever by a continuall change and degrees runneth unto an end, not perfecting or consummating, stands not a moment, but decayes without intermission. Thus was fulfilled what God said*, Genes. 2. 17. *In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* So he.

*Aug. De. peccat. Merit. & Remis. 1. 16.

Let me adde my conjecture. First, if God had not called Adam and Eve so sensibly to an account, yet had they died, by vertue of the former sentence. For the later sentence inflicts not death, which was then entred on them, but labour and pain, *In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the dayes of thy life*, Genes. 3. 17. And though it be said vers. 19. *In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return*: Yet this is but an explication of the former sentence, shewing that the manner of the death shall be by incineration, which was not so exactly speciallized before. Secondly, the same instant that Adam had eaten, I make no doubt but both their eyes were opened and they knew their nakednes, which was the first sensible degree towards death and corruption. For though the Scripture doth not say expressely, *Immediately their eyes were opened*, yet it implieth so much, as may appeare by the implicative particle *and*, Genes. 3. 6, &c. Eve *did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat, and the eyes of them both were opened*, &c. S. Augustine thus, * *How doth the Apostle say that our body is dead, (Rom. 8. 10.) when he speaks of the living, but because the condition of dying, arising from the sinne of the parents, sticks to the posteritie? So we also die, or are dying, the first houre of our being.* And again, * *The body is dead because of sinne. He saith not there, It is mortall, but, dead; albeit it is truely mortall, because it shall die.——So soon as they transgressed the commandment, death like some deadly disease was conceived in their members. For as soon as we were, I will not say born, but even conceived, what did we all but begin a certain sickness, by which we shall undoubtedly die?* IN THE MEANTIME

* *Quemadmodum corpus nostrum dicit Apostolus mortuum* (Rom 8. 10.) *cum adhuc de viventibus loqueretur, nisi quia jam ipsa conditio moriendi ex peccato parentum basit in prole?* De Gen. ad lit. 6. 26.

* *Corpus mortuum est propter peccatum: Nec ibi ait Mortale, sed Mortuum; quamvis utrique & mortale, quia morituram,——non vili praeceptum transgressi sunt, eorum membris, velut aliqua agritudo letbalis, mors ipsa concepta est. Quid enim aliud, non dicam nati, sed omnino concepti, nisi agritudinem quandam inchoavimus, qua finaliter sine dubio morituri? Ibid. 320*

LIFE WE ARE IN DEATH, and now *non vitam vivimus, sed mortem*; which was toucht at before, and must be handled again.

God (who drew light out of darknes, yea all things out of the unformed TOHV-BOHV, and that masse or rude lump out of nothing) is so good a God, and so divine a goodnes, that he would never have suffered sinne in this world, but that he knew how to extract good out of evill, and to turn mans sinne to his benefit. Neither would he have permitted death to enter upon man, but that he knew how to use the sting of death to mans greater happines, and how to *bring forth meat out of the eater, and sweetnes out of the strong*, Judg. 14. 14. As of the vipers flesh is made a preservative against the poison of the viper: so from this bitter cup of death ariseth health, joy, and salvation to mankinde.

*Augustine hath a witty collection from Plato and his follower Plotinus: Plato in Timæo writeth, * *that the spirits of men are tied with mortall bands by the lesser gods.* So Vives on the place citeth Plato, but Plotinus in lib. de dubijs Animæ, as he is also cited by Vives, on that place of Augustine, thus, * *Father Jupiter, having compassion of the afflicted souls, hath made their bands soluble, wherewith they are wearied.* These quotations at large, give light to S. Augustines meaning, which is subobscure: for he saith, * *Plotinus is commended for having understood Plato above the rest. He treating of the souls of men saith, The mercifull Father made them mortall bands.* Whether the particle *Is* aimeth at Plato, or Plotinus, appeareth not by Augustine. Bartholomæus * Sibylla appropriateth the word *Is* to Plato; I rather assigne it to Plotinus, as the good Expositor of Plato: Or it may be that S. Augustine, taking some words from both of them into one sentence, purposely left it doubtfull, unto whom the *Is* must be referred. Howsoever, his collection (as I said) is ingenious and subtile; * *So he thought that this very thing, that men are mortall in body, proceeds from the mercie of our divine Father, lest they should be alwayes held with the miserie of this life. Even as the very miserie of mankind, from which no man is free, could not pertain to the just judgement of the Almightie, if there had been no originall sinne*, as Augustine saith otherwhere. Gods judgement brought miserie and death for sinne; yet in death God remembred mercie, & distilled good out of it. I cannot omit this memorable speech of Gregory * Nazianzen, *Adam was expelled and extruded from this tree of life & from Paradise at once, by God, for sinne:—— And yet even in this case by death he gaineth the cutting off of sinne, lest the evill should be immortall. So was punishment turned into mercy.* He is excellently seconded by Rupert, * *How should we turn away with deaf eares the cure of the death of the soul, and the generall judgement, if we should never*

* Aug. De Civit. Dei. 9. 10.
* *Hominum animos mortalibus vinculis esse à diis minoribus illigatos.*

* *Jupiter Pater laborantas animas miseratus, earum vincula, quibus laborant, solubilia fabricavit.*
* *Plotinus Platonem præ cæteris intellexisse laudatur. Is, cùm de humanis animis ageret, Pater, inquit, misericors mortalia illis vincula faciebat.*
* Barth. Sib. Peregrin. Quæst. Decad. 1. c. 7. q. 2.

* *Ità hoc ipsum quòd mortales sint homines corpore, ad misericordiam Dei Patris pertinere arbitratus est, ne semper hujus vitæ miseriâ teneantur.*

* Naz. Orat. 2. de Pasch.

* Rup. De Trinit. 3. 24. &c.

never have died, that are so proud to day, & dying to morrow? Well therefore did our Lord God strike Man with the death of the flesh & of the body, lest he should be ignorant of the death of his soul, and sleep securely in his pleasures till the damning of the last day; that at least Man might be waked, even by the fear of the instantaneall death, and that he might not, like the immortall devil, adde prevarications to prevarication, but rather flee and avoid the pride & height of sinne by humble repentance. Let me adde, Hence is the patience of the Saints. Here are the crowns of the Martyrs, saith Chrysostome. This death causeth many vertues, which had else never been. *O unclean World, saith devout Bernard, if thou holdest me so shortly passing, what shouldest thou do long remaining? If ye desire more proofs, that death was appointed to Adam for sinne, and that he was kept from the tree of life, after he had sinned, lest his miserable life should have been immortall, consult with the authoritie of Irenæus, in his third book and 37. chap. of Hilarius, in his commentarie on Psal. 69. 26. of Hierome, on Esai 65. of Cyrill of Alexandria, about the middle of his third book against Julian, and they shall confirm you in this point, That death is a bitter, sweet, a compound of judgement and mercy, a loathsom pill, and a punishment, yet wrapt up in gold, and working out health and blessings for mankinde. *From the transgression two daughters are born, Sorrow and Death: which two daughters destroy their very ill mother. Augustine against two Epistles of the Pelagians 4. 4. *Although by death much good be reserved on good men (whereupon some have fitly discoursed even of the good of death) yet what hence can we commend but Gods mercie, that the punishment of sin is turned to good uses? I will seal up all with the saying of Cicero in the beginning of his third book de Oratore, where he spake wiser then he was aware of, *Life hath not been taken away from me by the immortall gods, but death hath been given. Death is a benefit, though it was appointed unto Adam for sinne, for one sinne onely, which is the next point to be explained.

3. It is true, that the wages due to any one sinne is death, and as true, that we commit many sinnes, which are rightly divided into originall and actuall. Actuall sinnes are of a thousand kindes committed by us, yet none of these our sinnes, nor Adams after-sinnes, but his first sinne onely produced death. Likewise, originall sin consisteth of two parts, of Adams transgression, & of our corruption. In Adams transgression were many sinnes involved: & our corruption consisteth both in the want of original justice, & in the positive ill-qualitie of our nature. Adams sinne is imputed to us, our corruption both inherent & imputed. His sin, as a qualitie, concerned himself, as relation, concerned us. As he was an individual man, it touched himself onely, as a comon person it drop't down upon us. His actuall sin is not propagated, his corrupting of our nature is deriv'd. And this corruption is both

a sinne

*O munde immunde, si sic me tenes breviter transeunde, quid faceres diu permanende?

*A culpa data sunt duæ filiæ, Tristitia, & Mors; quæ duæ filiæ pessimam matrem deferunt.

*Quamvis bonis conferatur per mortem plurimum boni, (unde nonnulli etiam DE BONO MORTIS congruenter disputaverunt) tamen & hinc quæ prædicanda est nisi misericordia Dei, quod in usus bonos convertitur pœna peccati?

*Mihi non à diis immortalibus vita erepta, sed mors donata est.

a sin and a punishment of sinne. Some late Divines have writte n: *Originall sinne is said to be twofold. 1 Imputed, which was inherent in Adam, and charged upon his posteritie. 2 Inherent, which is naturally propagated to us.* So, amongst others, Scharpius pag. 463. But they speak improperlie; for originall sinne is but one onely, made up of two parts or branches; indeed, perchance, parts constituent, not *ratione* onely, but *re differentes*; yet not so natively to be call'd *a double sinne*, as *one sinne*, of two steps, degrees, sections, composures, parts or branches: for originall sinne is not many, not two, but one onely, *viz* for which death was inflicted. And this is the point I must now insist upon, and thus I prove it apodictically.

Rom. 5. 12. *Death entred by sinne*; and verse 21, *Sinne reigned unto death.* Likewise, Rom. 6. 23, *The wages of sinne is death*; and 1. Corint. 15. 56, *The sting of death is sinne.* All in the singular number, evincing it to be one onely sinne. David complaineth Psal. 51. 5, *I was shapen in iniquitie, and in sinne did my mother conceive me.* In *sinne*, not in *sinnes*; both the Hebrew and the Vulgat Translation have all these places in the singular number. Concerning David, it is observable, (lest any one might imagine, that Davids mother was lascivious, and that therefore he complained, and so this complaint concerned David himself onely and personally, and not us) that it was no part of Davids intent, to disparage his mother, and Aquinas saith, *David was born of a lawfull wedlock: and we are sure by a certaintie of faith, that the lawfull use of marriage is no sinne.*

* *Certum est de fide, legitimum matrimonii usum non esse peccatum* Aquin. Cont. Gent. lib. 4. cap. 5c.

To this let me superadde Rom. 5. 18. Δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος, *Per unam offensam*, as Montanus readeth it, and this exposition is by our last Translation admitted into the margine. But of this point more by and by.

Neither is it onely one, but it is all alike; not more in the vill, not lesse in the good. Rom. 3. 9, *Are we better then the Gentiles? We have proved that Jews and Gentiles are all under sinne, as it is written, There is none righteous, no not one.* Vers. 19, *All the world is become guilty*, or, *subject to the judgement of God.* Again, vers. 22. *There is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glorie of God.* And before, he exactly describeth the corruption of every man. Galat. 3. 22, *The Scripture hath concluded all under sinne.* Augustine De Civitate Dei 16. 27, *If infants are born sinners, not properly, but originally; certainly in the same manner that they are sinners, they are acknowledged to be also transgressours of that law which was given in Paradise.* How could one infant transgresse the law in Paradise, more then an other? Genes. 17. 14, *He hath broken my covenant.* Which words you use to interpret of breaking the covenant in Adam, by originall sinne, aswell as of breaking the covenant of circumcision. Augustine in the place above cited, when he had said, *Since it is not the fault*

Si parvuli nascuntur, non propriè, sed originaliter, peccatores; profectò, eo modo quo sunt peccatores, etiam prevaricatores legis illius, quæ in Paradiso data est, agnoscuntur.

fault of the infant, whose soul God threatned to cut off; neither hath he broken Gods covenant, but his parents, who took no care to circumcise him (for such a childe *discerneth not his right hand from his left*, Jonas 4. 11, and such *little ones have no knowledge between good and evil*, Deuter. 1. 39.) then he resolveth thus, * *Infants, not in regard of their own life, but in respect of the common source of mankinde, have all broken Gods covenant in him in whom they have all sinned.* Again, * *In Adam he himself hath also sinned with all the rest.* My question here is, *Did not all children sinne alike in Paradise?* Aquinas answereth, *All are born equally sinners, all equally obnoxious to originall sinne; so that in them that die in originall sinne onely, there is no difference in fault or punishment answering unto it.* See Estius 2. Sentent. Distinct. 33. Sect. 5. and before him Lumbard, with his army of Schoolmen.

Three places there are most fully demonstrative, both that it was one offence onely, and that this offence was of one person onely. Rom. 5. 15. *By the sinne*, the single singular sinne, *of one* (for none of it is in the plurall number) *many are dead.* Death crept not in by more sinnes, or by more sinners, but for one onely offence of one person onely. It is not τῷ ἑνὶ παραπτώματι but τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι, *per peccatum unius.* He might have said as easilie (if he could have said it as truly) *by the sinne of two*, if by Eves sin properly we had died. This is also excellently seconded in the next verse, Rom. 5. 16. *And not as it was by* ONE *that sinned*, διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος (there is the singularitie of the person) *so is the gift: for the judgement was of* ONE *to condemnation* (which you must not interpret of *one* Adam, or *one* Person, but of *one* sinne, if you make the antithesis to have marrow and sinnews; and so the Old Bishops Bible reades it) *but the free gift is* ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων *of many offences unto justification.* So to the singularitie of one person, you see annexed the singularitie of one offence. The same truth is confirmed and reiterated, Rom. 5. 17, 18, 19: every verse proving it was but *one* person, and *one* sinne.

The Fathers joyn issue with us. Chrysostom Homil. on 1. Corinth. 9, *Adam by one sinne did draw in death.* And again, *He by one onely sinne brought so much evil and death.* For if Adam had not sinned, as he had not propagated his personall gifts, graces, acquisite vertues, nor experimentall knowledge; so after his first sinne, which is derived to us, his other sinnes were meerly personall, and one onely is become naturall to all of us: all his other sinnes were bound up in the sole reference unto himself, none imputed or derived to his posteritie. And therefore originall sinne hath no degrees, *nec suscipit magis aut minus*; or hath more branches or parts in any childe of Adam, then in others; but equally and alike extendeth unto all, none free, none more infected then others, as I proved before.

Paulinus calleth it * *The fatherly poison, by which the father having*

* *Cum hoc nulla sit culpa parvuli, cujus dixit animam peritaram, nec ipse dissipaverit Testamentum Dei, sed majores, qui eum circumcidere non curárunt.*

* *Parvuli, non secundum vitæ suæ proprietatem, sed secundum communem generis humani originem, omnes in illo uno Testamentum Dei dissipaverunt, in quo omnes peccaverunt.*

* *In Adam, cum omnibus, etiam ipse peccavit.* Aquin. 1. 2. q. 82. art. 4.

τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον.

having transgressed hath infected his whole kinde. Others stile it *The venime of the loyns.* Chrysostom, on 1. Corinth. 9. termeth it *The radicall sinne.* Augustine saith, * *There is one sinne in which all have sinned, and therefore all men are said to have sinned in one Adam, and by one sinne of Adam, because all were that one man.* Item, * *That one sinne which is so great, and was committed in a place and condition of so great happines, that in one man originally, and, that I may so say, radically all mankinde should be damned, is not done away but by Christ.* And often he beats on this point, that it was one sin which overthrew us. * *One, none but one transgression the Apostle will have to be understood,* saith he against Julian. And again, * *Infants die guiltie onely of originall sinne, men of yeares guiltie of all sins which by a wicked life they have added to that one.* Ignatius calleth it *The ancient impietie.* Irenæus stileth it *The hand-writing written by Adam.* All in the singular number pointing at one man onely, and at one sinne onely.

Two points are cleared:

We are appointed to die { for *one* sinne onely, / of *one* person onely.

It followeth by the native and genuine method; This person was *one* man; This *one* man was Adam: And so by consequent it was not Eves sinne for which death was appointed to us. And first of the first part.

4. That this person sinning was *one* man, seemeth evidenced, Rom. 5. 16, Δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος, *By one that sinned.* It is not said Διὰ πολλὰ ἁμαρτήσαντος. Yet if that proof reach not home, but may suffer extension, even to Angels or spirits; others shall. 1. Cor. 15. 21, Δι' ἀνθρώπου ὁ θάνατος. *By man came death, and by man the Resurrection of the dead.* You may as well deny the Resurrection by the Sonne of man, as that sinne or death came not by man. Again, Rom. 5. 12. Δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου, *By one man sinne entred into the World, and death by sinne*: the word ἀνθρώπου demonstrating the humane nature; and ἑνὸς joyned with it, necessarily pointing and signing out the masculine, and not the feminine. Rom. 5. 19, Διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου, *By the disobedience of one man*; where most evidently, not onely the humane nature is signed, and marked out unto us, but also the masculine sex; the *He*, and not the *She*.

Having found that he was a Man, for whose sinne death was appointed, let us now follow the sent, and we shall trace out who he was; which is the main point of inquirie.

Searching the Scriptures, even close to the former place occurreth this, 1. Corint. 15. 22, *As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.* He who confesseth the quickning power of the second Adam unto Resurrection, must also confesse the weaknes of the first Adam, and that *In him all men die.* Indeed it is said, Eccl. 25. 24. Ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀρχὴ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ἀποθνήσκομεν πάντες

* *Virus paternum quo universitatem generis sui pater prævaricatus infecit.* Apud August. Epist. 105.
* *Esse unum peccatum, in quo omnes peccaverunt, & ideò dici omnes homines in uno Adamo, & uno Ada peccato peccâsse, quia omnes ille unus homo fuerant.* De Peccat. Merit. & Remiss. 1. 10.
* *Illud unum peccatum, quod tam magnum, in loco & habitu tantæ felicitatis admissum est, ut in uno homine originaliter, atque, ut ità dixerim, radicaliter totum genus hominum damnaretur, non solvitur nisi per Christum.* Enchirid. cap. 48.
* *Unum, non nisi unum delictum intelligi vult Apostolus.* Cont. Julian. 1. 6.
* *Parvuli moriuntur soli peccato originali obnoxii; adulti omnibus peccatis quæ malè vivendo addiderunt ad illud unum.* Enchir. cap. 43.
* Ignatius. Epist. ad Trallianos.
* Iren. lib. 5.

word, in the Accusative, *Of the woman came the beginning of sin and through her we all die.* But of Adam the phrase is used in the Genitive, Rom. 5. three severall times, *Per illum, non in illa morimur.* The Divines distinguish them two: We die by her, and in Adam; We also die by the Devill, as he was the tempter of her, as well as by her, she being the tempter of Adam, by them both occasionally, by him and onely in him effectually. So for the former part of the words, it is true, *Eve began sinne, but Adam made it compleat.* She was *principium*, but *principium principiatum*: Satan was the *principium principians*, *Abo never primo primus. He was a murderer from the beginning.* John 8. 44. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, not from the first absolute beginning, for then Satan had no being: not from his own beginning; for at his creation he was good, as all things els were: but so soon as ever man was, he resolved to destroy man, and with reference to that intention he was a man-slayer or a murderer of man from the beginning of man. From Satan was the beginning of sin, from Eve a secconding, a middesse, a continuation, you may call it, *an other beginning, secundo primum.* But had not Adam sinned, death had not reigned: for *in Adam all die*, it was never said of Eve, *in Eve we die.*

Augustine saith, *God made some certain creatures solitarias, & quodammodo silvagas, solitarie, and as it were wandring alone, as eagles, kites, lions, wolves; other creatures gregales, that love to trompe, fly, shoal, and herd together; as pigeons, starres, fishes, deers; and made divers of them, all at once, of severall kinds, and not onely two of each kinde, by which the rest should be propagated; but he made the male-mum & fœmam, one and single, and would not create the woman when he created the man, but made her of man himself, that all mankinde should be derived from one man.* He answereth otherwhere, *That original sinne might come from one onely man.*

The Apostle saith most divinely, 1 Timot. 2. 14. *Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.* From whence though the ignorant may think, that Eve was the sinner, and Adam was not, yet they erre, not understanding the Apostle. His main intent is to prove, that *a woman ought to be silent and subject, and not usurp authoritie over the man*, as a talking woman doth; and this he effecteth by two reasons. First, *Adam was first formed, then Eve.* The reason holds of things of the same species. Otherwise beasts and birds were created before Adam. Secondly, *Adam was not deceived, but Eve*: not first deceived, not deceived by a beast, and one of the worst of them, a serpent. Therefore she is unfit to be any longer a teacher. Chrysostom cries, *The woman taught once, and marred all, therefore let her teach no longer.* Hence it appeareth it was no part of the Apostles meaning to handle, Whether the sinne of Adam or of Eve caused mankinde to fall (which is our main point) for the transgression here mentioned was not that sinne, that great sin, but

* *Ab Eve initium peccati, ab Adamo complementum.*

* Aug. De Civit. 12. 22.

* *Vt omnes ex homine uno diffunderetur genus humanum.*

but *vitium, divertículum transiens, a peccadillo*, a little sinne, in respect of that great *iniquity* and *impietie*, which ingaged all mankinde: much lesse did the Apostle intend to excuse Adam from that great presumptuous offence, in which he onely was. That sin of his being called *offence*, Rom. 5. 15. which must needs be a crying sin, and almost infinite, since it is opposed to Christs obedience, called there *Gods gift*. Adam was not deceived, because no man is properly deceived, but of him who hath an intent to deceive: now the Devil onely had such an intent, and thereupon deceived Eve. Wherefore he complaineth saying, *the Serpent beguiled me*, Genes. 3. 13, & the Apostle ratifieth it, 2. Corinth. 11. 3. *The Serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty*. And in this manner Eve onely *being* * *deceived was in the transgression*. For Satan set not upon Adam. *The Devill set not upon him that had received in presence the heavenly commandment, but upon her that had learned it of her husband*, saith Ambrose; Yea S. Augustine opineth * *That by that serpentine craft, by which the woman was seduced, Adam could not have been seduced*. Tertullian speaketh thus to womankinde, * *Thou art the Devils doore, thou art she that first invaded him whom the Devil could not set upon*. If he could not set upon him, much lesse could he have overcom him. Hierom saith, * *the Apostle doth prove that the Devil could not seduce Adam, but Eve*. But then comes Eve in her simplicitie, intending no hurt or deceit to her husband, & upon three other grounds specialized Genes. 3. 6. First, *she saw that the tree was good for food*. Secondly, *it was pleasant to the eyes*. Thirdly, *a tree to be desired to make one wise*. She (I say) upon these three motives did both eat and give Adam to eat. So Adam was not deceived, either first or immediately, by the Serpent or serpentine deceit, as Eve was: neither doth Adam complain, that the Serpent or Eve beguiled him; but when he derived the fault from himself, the worst that he said of Eve was this, Genes. 3. 12, *The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree*. Neither doth the Scripture any where impute a malicious, envious, or guilefull intent to Eve, in drawing Adam into the transgression. Nor doth the Apostle say absolutely, *Adam was not in the transgression*; but, *Adam was not deceived*, or brought into the transgression by fraud. For the word ἠπατήθη signifieth to be deceived by art and craft: so the Devill perswaded Eve, *That God of envy unto man forbad him that tree*, saith * Augustine, and perhaps told her it was no sin for her to eat, because she received no immediate commandement, whereas Adam knew it was a sinne, but therefore might think it easilie pardonable, *because he had formerly known no experience of Gods severitie*, saith the same * Augustine. And yet for all this Adam might be in a transgression, in the transgression, and the greatest transgression, though not in the transgression of being seduc'd. And for his transgression death is appointed for us,

For

* *Diabolus non est adversus eum qui coram acceperat cœleste mandatum, sed eum quæ à viro didicerat.* Ambr. lib. de Paradiso cap. 12. *Dolo illo serpentino*, &c Aug. De Gen. ad lit. 11. 42.

* *Tu es Diaboli janua, tu es quæ eum invasisti quem Diabolus aggredi non valuit.* Tert. lib. De Habitu muliebri.

* *Probat quòd Diabolus non poterat seducere Adam, sed Evam.* Hieron. lib. 1. adversus Jovinianum, circa medium.

* Aug. De Gen. ad lit. 11. 30.

* Aug. De Civit. 14. 11.

For in Adam all die. Abel was the first who died the bodily death, yet Abel died in Adam and if for Adams sinne death had not been appointed to him first, Abel had not died yet, since *Morte morieris* was spoken to Adam alone, before Eve was created and it may be it implieth, that upon his sinne all that any way came of him, either by avulsion of some part, as Eve did, or by propagation, should die in him. And so though Eve had eaten, if Adam had not sinned, neither Adam, nor perhaps Eve herself had died. And if Adam had eaten and Eve forborn, yet perhaps Eve should have died: for Eve was in Adam as well as we, 1. Corinth. 11. 8. *The man was not of the woman, but the woman of the man.* And in him was she to stand or fall, live or die, as well as we. *In Adam all die*, and she among the rest, since she was one, and a part of that all. If my above mentioned speculations require further proof, consider Rom. 5. 14. *Death reigned from Adam*, where he is expresly mentioned, as being, in my interpretation, the *Idea* of mankinde, and we being in him, *tanquam in principio activo*. Satan sinned against God in tempting the woman, the woman sinned against God in eating and offering the fruit unto the man. If thou, O Adam, hadst not consented, neither of these sinnes had hurt thee or mankinde. * *Adam was we all.* Give me leave to say so, since S. Augustine saith, * *We all were that one Adam.* Nor did God first challenge Eve, but Adam, nor her so punctually as he did Adam, Genes. 3. 9. And vers. 22, it is not said of Eve, but of Adam, ironically, *Adam is become like one of us*: for he was the root of mankinde, Eve was but a branch of Adam before or when she sinned, and no root of mankinde actuall, but potentiall; for she sinned when she was a virgin. Justin Martyr in his dialogue with Triphon thus, *Eve being an intemerated virgin, and conceiving by the Serpent, brought forth disobedience, and by consequent, death.* Theodoret on those words of the Psalmist, Psal. 51. 1. &c. *The transgression of the commandment went before Eves conception: for after the transgression, and the divine sentence, and the privation of Paradise Adam knew Eve his wife; and she having conceived brought forth Cain.* Had Adam carnally known Eve before he sinned, yea after herself sinned, she had conceived, and then the issue had had no originall sin: yea, he is no worse Divine then Aquinas, who holdeth that *at this instant if one by miracle were created an humane creature, body & soul, he should not have originall sin.* * *And if Adam had sinned, & not Eve, we had fallen into originall sin; and if she had eaten, and not he, we had not been stain'd with originall sinne.* Scharpius saith, *The cause of originall sinne was Adam, not Eve; and Adams sinne, not Eves, doth passe to the posteritie.* Tertullian proveth that Eve was nevertheless a virgin, because being in Paradise she was called a woman. * *A woman*, saith he, *pertains to the sex it self, not to the degree of the sex.* One may be called

* *Adam erat nos omnes.*
* *Omnes eramus ille unus Adam.* De peccat. Merit. & Remis. l. 10.

1. 2. Quæst. 18 Art 4.

* Art. sequenti.

[a] *Mulier ad sexum ipsum, non ad gradum sexûs pertinet.* Tertull. lib. De velandis Virginibus.

call'd a woman, though not a wife; but a *non-mulier*, a no-woman can not either be or be call'd a wife. I adde, she was a wife, & so called, Genes. 2.25. and yet, till after Adam fell, she was a virgin, espoused, married, yet not known carnally. She was termed *Isha*, or *Issa*, *Virago*, before the fall, Genes. 2.23. because she was taken out of *Ish*, or *Is*, *out of man*. She was also stiled *The female*, and *wife*; but she was never called *Eve*, during her creation and innocency, or in the *interim* between her fall and Adams. But after Adams sin he first called his wives name *Eve*, Genes. 3.20. *because she was the mother of all living*. Not as if now did then live as from her, or were born of her, when Adam so called her; but the great Calculator of natures, the *Nomenclator*, the Onomastick, or exact and true Nomenclator of all things brought before him, thought fit to name her *Eve*, that is, *The mother of all living*; not before, but after her fall, because, in my opinion, she had not been *Mater viventium*, if she alone had sinned. Her sinne might have had other punishment, her personall fault had ended in her personall chastisement. Eve was created in Paradise, and, for all her sin, we had continued still in Paradise, if Adam had kept in it: but as Adam was made out of Paradise, so out of it again by his fall he brought both himself & us. S. Ambrose saith, [a] *Adam was, & in him we were all, he perished, & in him all perished.* Eve was onely a part of Adam, till his fall, he being till then the onely root: after his sinne she is now also *Eva, mater viventium*, a root, yet *radix de radice*: we receive our sap, & bring forth fruit through both of them. And for all this, both Scripture and Fathers runne with a torrent, ascribing that great sin, which plunged mankinde into destruction, not unto Eve, save onely as the occasioner, but unto Adam, as the immediate causer. And though Eve sinned before Adam, and that in divers respects; yet is he chiefly, yea onely faultie, for prefenting vs, by his fall, to destruction. Hosea 6.7. *They like Adam have transgressed the covenant there*; or (as the Vulgar hath it, joyning *Ibi* to the latter clause) *Ibi prævaricati sunt in me. Ibi*, saith Hierom, *that is, in Paradise.* And Adam is excellently pointed out, Esai 43.27, *Thy first father hath sinned.* Eve is not mentioned, for her sinne, considered by itself, reached not to them, nor hurt any but herself *per se*, and us *per accidens*, as Adam yeelded to her temptation. When God had denounced severall punishments, first to Eve, then to Adam, and proper to each by themselves, he added this to Adam onely, *Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.* For even in him, and by him was Eve to return to dust, and by his offence formally *Death came on all.* And therefore not from Eve, but from Adam doth S. Luke draw our pedegree, Luke. 3.38, *Which was the sonne of Adam, which was the sonne of God.* And therefore as the Genealogies were ever drawn from the males (perchance to shew that the woman was but

[a] *Fuit Adam, & in illo fuimus omnes: periit Adam, & in eo perierunt omnes.* Ambr. in Lucam lib. 7.

accidental

accidentall to our first making; and the first sinne reducing all up to the Protoplast Adam, who derived originall sinne both to Eve and all us, though in different manner. So when they had drawn all their Genealogies downe to Christ, who had no man to be his father, nor had originall sinne, but satisfied for it & all other sinnes, all Genealogies are ended, yea counted by the Apostle as *foolish and vain*, Titus 3. 9. Against one of these passages if it be objected, that Judah is not termed after his father, but full often, yea alwayes after his mother, *The sonne of Zeruiah*, for she was the sister of David, 1. Chron. 2. 16. I answer, that Zeruiah the mother of the three famous brethren, Joab, Abishai, Asahel was, perhaps, married to some base ignoble groom before David came to his greatnes: or she herself was an extraordinary *Virago*, active in State, plotting and furthering the plots of her children, though she crost her brother David; and therefore (as I take it) she is named not so much in honour as in dislike, *These men the sonnes of Zeruiah be too hard for me*, 2. Sam. 3. 39. Or lastly, the father of Joab had committed such a sinne of sinnes, that the remembrance of him was odious, and might resemble Judas Iscariot, who deserved that *in the next generation his name should be blotted out*, Psal. 109. 13.

When Adam transgressed my statutes, 2. Esdras 7. 11, 12. *then were the entrances of this world made narrow, full of sorrow and travell.* And in reference, it may be, to Adams especiall sinning both a man-childe was born before a woman-childe, and a man-childe died before a woman-childe, & the males onely were circumcised, and Adam himself died ten yeares before Eve, as Salianus, out of Marianus Scotus, Genebrard, & Fevardentius, collecteth; though he vex a woman els, except Eve, from the creation til the Law of Moses is recorded to have outlived their good husbands. As for Er & Onan, they were wicked, & for their sin cut off shortly, Genes. 38. 7, &c. Sure I am, he had an especiall manner of transgression, since some are punished who *have not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression*, Rom. 5. 14. Other sinnes we sinned, & are like to Adam: but herein we are unlike. His sinne hurt us as well as himself: our sinnes hurt not him, but our selves. Bellarmin hath brought unto my hand the three following authorities: Tertullian, [a] *Every soul is counted in Adam, untill it be reckoned in Christ.* Hierom, [b] *Every one of us fell in Paradise with Adam.* Cyprian derives the infants sin from Adam onely. For we were in him *tanquã in actiuo principio*. In him, to stand or fall. *Adam is the figure of him that was to come*, Rom. 5. 14. Was Eve a type of Christ? was Christ ever resembled or compared or contra-opposed unto Eve? The Apostle Rom. 5. 15, 16, sheweth wherein Adam was like and unlike to Christ (of which hereafter.) And most divinely to our purpose, verse 17, &c. *If by one mans offence, death reigned by one, much more the righteous*

[a] *Omnis anima, cousq; in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recenseatur.* Tert. lib. *De Anima.*

[b] *Vnusquisq; nostrum in Paradiso cum Adamo cecidit.* Hieron in Mich. 2.

[c] Cypr. lib. 3. Epist. 8. Ad Fidum.

ſhall reigne by one Ieſus Chriſt. Nothing, or intimation of more ſinnes then of one; of more persons firſt ſinning that one ſinne, then of one, and that one was not Eve, but Adam: therefore as Chriſts Merits onely ſave us, ſo Adams ſinne onely did deſtroy us. Cherubim ſaveth Cherubim, Type and Antitype muſt agree. When the Apoſtle ſaith of Adam, *τὸν μέλλοντος τύπος*, *τύπος futuri* (as the Interlinearie reades it;) neer it, but it; not *qui*, but *qui*, proveth the excluſion of Eve. But of the firſt man Adam and the laſt Adam, is a noted ſweet reſemblance, 1. Corinth. 15. 45. Where he holdeth it not enough to ſay, *The firſt Adam*, but leſt Eve might ſeem to be included in the compariſon, he addeth, *The firſt man Adam*, and ſo compareth him to Chriſt. Likewiſe verſe 47. *The firſt man is of the earth earthy: the ſecond man is the Lord from heaven.* Yet was not Chriſt the ſecond man in number, but in repreſentation of mankinde, being the ſubſtance of the firſt ſhadow. Adam was the firſt, the onely one who hurt us; Chriſt is the ſecond man, the onely one who helpe thus. Yea, I think I may be bold to averre, that Chriſt would have taken on him the feminine ſex, if by Eve we had fallen: but ſince we fell by man, by man onely; therefore our Redeemer, though he came of a woman, yet was made a man. And Chriſt having determined to be, not a woman, but a man, I dare further avouch, if he had been *a ſtone cut out*, not* *a ſtone cut out without hands*, Daniel 2. 34, without the help of man, as he was: if he had not been conceived by the Holy Ghoſt; if the Bleſſed Virgin had not been over-ſhadowed by the power of God onely; if Chriſt had been begotten by one of the ſonnes of Adam, with an ordinarie and naturall generation; even Chriſt himſelf had had both originall and actuall ſinne, and had died for himſelf by and through Adam, and had wanted a Redeemer for himſelf; much leſſe could he be our Redeemer. But Chriſt was that STONE. *This Stone which the builders refuſed, is become the head-ſtone of the corner*, Pſal. 118. 22. *A tried ſtone, a precious corner-ſtone, a ſure foundation*, Eſai. 28. 16. Let me adde a little: Since Adam was made without the help of man or woman, and Eve came of man without woman: ſince all the whole world of rationall people proceed from both man and woman; it was convenient enough, that there ſhould be a miraculous and fourth kinde of generation, different from all the reſt; namely; that Chriſt ſhould come of a woman alone, without the aſſiſtance of man, that he might be free from originall ſinne, which was firſt committed by Adam and his maſculine brood, and not without his ſeed and the *artifex ſpiritus* in it.

In which regard (without derogation to the thrice-bleſſed Mother of our Lord, that holy-a-viternally Virgin Mary, now, next to her Sonne, the greateſt Saint in heaven, and placed deſervedly above Angels and Archangels, Cherubims and Seraphims)

* *Et abſciſſus eſt lapis Dominus, & Salvator, ſine manibus; id eſt; abſque coitu & humano ſemine, de utero virginali.* Hieron. in Dan. 2. 34. *Quid eſt Præciſus de monte, ſine manibus? Natus de Gente Judæorum, ſine opere hominum. Omnes enim qui naſcuntur, de opere maritali naſcuntur: ille de Virgine natus, ſine manibus natus eſt: per manus enim opus humanum ſignificatur, quò manus humana non acceſſerunt; ubi maritalis amplexus non fuit, ſætus temeus fuit.* Aug. in Pſal. 99. 5. ipſi, 70 ſecuto, 98, ſub finem.

raphans) great Divines do make this difference; She, who was not begotten but by man, was subject to originall sinne, but her sonne, *the Seed of God*, was free, even in his humane Nature, from all infection, originall and actuall, because in his framing there was no admixture of virile and muliebrile cooperation. For the poysoning of our nature arose from Adams sinne, and not from Eves. Moreover, if by miracle God should preserve a man from any touch or tickling smack of lustfull sinne in the act of generation, the fathers personall holines should not discharge his childe from originall sinne, for the traducted nature is corrupt.* Bellarmine goes one step further, thus, *If both man and woman, the children of Adam, by Gods singular privilege were exempted from lust, in the generation of their children; yet should they transmit sinne to their offspring.* For though S. Augustine saith expresly,* that *it is not the generation, but the lust, which properly transmits sinne*; yet S. Augustine may be interpreted to speak of generations meerly usuall and wholy naturall, not privileged or extraordinarie. Curssed therefore are the Pelagians, who say, *Sinne and death entred by Eve.* Sinne personall did, but not originall, nor death. Grosse is the ignorance of the Pelagians, who when the Apostle saith ἀι ἀνθρώπου, think to delude it with this silly shift, that ἀνθρωπος signifieth either man or woman; and say it is not ἀι ἀνθρωπης, which must needs have been understood of Adam onely. I answer, ἀι ἀνθρώπου is fully equivalent to ἀι ἀνθρωπης, since ἀνθρωπος is not, and can not be understood of the feminine. Secondly, the Apostle maketh the Antithesis between that ἀνθρωπου and Christ, which can not be between Eve and Christ. Thirdly, a little after the Apostle twice expresseth Adam, but never nameth or meaneth Eve. Lastly, It is said remarkably concerning Abraham, Hebr. 11. 12, *There sprang even of one, and him as good as dead, many.* And more approaching to our purpose, Act. 17. 26, *God made all mankinde* ἐξ ἑνὸς αἵματος, *of one blood*, with apparent reference to Adam onely. Therefore as the naturall generation is ascribed to Adam and Abraham onely, though Eve and Sara in their sort concurre to the materiall part of the embryon, because the Men do conferre the formall: so the degenerating unto vice is justly imputed to Adam onely, though Eve did minister the occasion, because his consent and action onely could give form and shape to that prodigious sinne which overthrew mankinde.

5. From this point more questions may yet arise. First, If Adam & Eve had not sinned, but Cain or some other of their children, whether that sinne had been derived to their posteritie.* Aquinas is for the affirmative, others for the negative. *Because the first man onely represented our whole nature, all other mens sinnes are particular and personall, & can not infect others.* Thus farre Scharplus.

I make a second Question. If Adam and Eve had continued

* Bell. De Amiss. gratiæ & Statu pecc. 4. 12.

* *Non generationem, sed libidinem esse, quæ proprie peccatum trahacio.* De peccat. Merit. & Remiss. 1. 9.

* Aquin. quæst. 5. De Malo art. 4.

in innocencie, and had been confirmed in grace, whether any of their children could have sinned.

Augustine embraceth the affirmative of this Question, saying, * *As happie as Adam and Eve were, so happie had been the whole companie of mankinde, if they, nor none of them committed sinne which should receive damnation.* The same* elsewhere, *The children which should have been begotten of innocent Adam and Eve,* * *had been led to the same state, if they all had lived justly and obediently.* * Estius seconds him, alledging these reasons: First, *Adam and Eve had not begotten children in better condition than themselves were created of God; therefore they should have begot just children, but not confirmed in justice.* Secondly, *Angels were not ordained to blessednes, but by the merit of their free-will to good or evill, and we are to think the like of men.* * *They were not to be setled in the end, till they had finished the course of this way, which is the time of meriting.* Thirdly, Hugo and Lumbard say, *God propounded to Adam and Eve invisible goods and eternall, to be sought by their merits, and ordained that by merit they might come to reward.* Aquinas * determineth, *That children born in the state of innocencie, had not been confirmed in justice:* yea, * *it seems not possible, that in the state of innocencie children should be born confirmed in justice.* So Aquine, and Gregorie de Valentia on him.

A second way is taken by * Abulensis, and followed by * Catharinus, viz. That if Adam had not sinned, his posteritie should have been confirmed in originall justice, but not *in gratia gratum faciente, in saving grace.* Where they do very ill, to set such inward friends so much at odds; for originall justice and *gratia gratum faciens* differ onely *ratione*, not *re*; and none could have one, that had not both, they being in the state of innocencie glued inseparably: but they had been born *in gratia gratum faciente*, saith * Aquine. Therefore do I conclude, both with Aquine against them, that the posteritie of innocent Adam had been born *in gratia gratum faciente*, and with them against Aquine, that they had been confirmed in originall justice.

Scotus seeing the inconveniences of Aquin's position, takes a third way, namely, That the posterity of just Adam should have been born both in justice and grace, but not confirmed till they had overcome their first temptation. Before I come to grapple with Scotus, I must first trie my strength against Aquinas; from whose position these three consequences do necessarily flow, as * Estius his great disciple confesseth. First, that some of Adams children might have continued obedient, others might have been disobedient to God. Secondly, That the just children of innocent Adam should have been tempted by Satan, not *once* onely, but often. Thirdly, That without temptation they might have sinned, by their own will onely. Against the

* Aug. De Civit. 1 4. 10.

* De Gen. ad lit. 9. 3.

* *Ad eundem perduceretur statum, si omnes juste obedienterque vixissent.*

* Est. in 2. Sent. dist. 20. paragr. 5.

* *Non prius erant in termino constituendi, quam vie hujus curriculum, quod est tempus merendi, peregissent.*

* Aquin. part. 1. quæst. 100. art. 2.

* *Non videtur possibile, quòd pueri in statu innocentiæ nascerentur in justitia confirmati.*

* Abul. in Gen. 3. qræst. 6. & 7.

* Cath. in locum.

* Aquin. part. 1. quæst. 100. art. 1. ad. 2.

* Est. in 2. Sent. dist. 20. Parag. 5.

the first consequence I thus argue. If some of innocent Adams children had sinned, should they have had any children or none? Not none; for the blessing of *crescite & multiplicamini* reached to all. Should their children then naturally have been good or bad? Not good and innocent; for that is not the issue of actually disobedient offenders. If they had been born wicked, then had their generations so been, and the generations from them to the Worlds end: and millions of souls had perished, which fell not in Adam, but in and by their other parents, which crosseth the main current of Divinitie. For Adam onely repriesented all mankinde, and in him onely were we to stand or fall. Adam in Paradise, even before his sinne, was a Type of Christ, (compare Genes. 2. 24. with Ephes. 5. 30, &c.) and stood *idem liter* for us all. See Rom. 5. 12, &c. He was *caput & universus Adam erat nos unitus, & nos omnes eramus ille unus Adam.* By Aquins consequence more first Adams are set up, by which mankinde might have fallen, and so more second Adams to restore them. But by one man came death, and by the blood of onely one are we redeemed. Again, if innocent Adams just children, though unconfirm'd, had begot just unconfirmed children, & yet after that generation these unconfirm'd fathers had sinned; what children should they have begot after their sinne? should the same father have brought forth life and death? good children and bad? and seen some of his children happie, and himself and other children miserable? And suppose the mothers had sinned, and not the fathers; should the mothers have been in the stead of the first Adam? should the children have fallen in them, or no? A third absurditie followeth from Aquins position, namely, That the righteous should have begotten not one constantly righteous from the beginning to the Worlds end; but everie one that had sinned, should have begotten sinfull children for ever. And so, for one that had continued righteous and been translated, millions might have been sinners, and died. Lastly, no one man had been certain of his salvation any time of his life, though he had lived never so long, and never so justly; which yet, even *in statu lapsi*, hath been granted to some few.

Against the second consequence from Aquins doctrine, viz. *That even the just children of innocent Adam should have been tempted by Satan, not once, but often*, I oppose these demands: How many times are included in the word *often*? or when should there have been an end of tempting? If at any set time of their life; why at that time, and never before nor after? If they should have been tempted all the dayes of their life, the felicitie of Eden might have been more troubled, and fluid then the waters of it, and I might justly say, *O poore Paradise, unsetled integritie, provoked or tempted innocence, tremulous estate; where Satan the stronger had power sometimes to tempt, and malice enough*

enough to charge home with cunning, and vain the weakened power always to fall.

Immissa vel ascendentes.

The third consequence is somewhat questionable, as inferring, that all and every of Mankinde, even without any temptation, might have sinned by their own will onely, making the happines of Paradise worse then our present unhappines, where man sinneth not but being tempted, either by Satan, or his own concupiscence, Jam. 1. 14. For all the evill thoughts of our will are truly divided into *infused and ascending*, and none of the *ascending* have been in the will before they were In the understanding, and nothing hath been in the understanding that hath not been in the senses. Besides, death was to be inflicted, not for the sinne of the will onely, or meerly, but for the eating of the forbidden fruit.

These or the like, or worse inconveniences, perhaps, made Scotus to varie from Aquine, and more probably to defend, That upon triumph over their first temptation, every one of the children of innocent Adam had been confirmed in grace. *We may not yeild this*, saith Estius, *And it is not true, and there is no reason for it, and it little agreeth with the commination*, In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die, Genes. 2. 17. saith Gregorie de Valentia. I answer, That the words *In the day* may prove, that they might not have been tempted the first or second day, or in a short time; but they hinder not, but upon overcoming of their first temptation, they might every day after have been confirmed. Again, the commination was not spoken to Adam, as an individuall person, but to him as the Feoffee of mankinde. If every one should have stood for himself and his posteritie, what is Adams sinne more to me then Cains, or my last and immediate fathers first actuall sinne, if neither Adam, nor any of his children had sinned before mine own father? But since we did fall, not personally in our selves, not in our immediate parents, not in any but Adam, by the breach of that commination: so on the contrarie, not by any other parents obedience, not by our own obedience, but by the obedience of that one man unto that one commination, we should have stood, yea have been confirmed. Thus have you mine opinion against Scotus, much more against Aquinas: and this is my reason. Naturally, by the blessing of ordinarie generation, every creature was to beget its like according to kinde: the branch was to partake of the vertue and nature of the root; and so, without Adams representing us, he should have begot us in such an estate as he himself was, with a libertie to good and evill, with a power to fall or not fall. But as Gods infinite wisdome chose him out, with expresse or tacit compact, that if he stood, all his posteritie should live in him; and if he sinned, they should all die in him: it seemeth reasonable, that we should

have

have had as much good by him, as we have had harm from him, and he being to have been confirmed in grace, upon the overcoming of the first suggestion, should have begot us his children, not voluble, deambulatory, and pendulous, but like himself confirm'd in grace. For as the Angels were confirm'd in grace, so soon as they had declar'd them-selves to adhere to God, (or els, when were they confirm'd, or are they not confirmed yet? * *Presently after one act informed with charitie the Angels were blessed*, saith Aquine) so should Adam have been confirmed presently, if he had powerfully adhered to God. Yea, I think if he had but at that first suggestion disliked Eves eating, or rather kept her and himself from consenting to the eating, that nor they, not any of their posterity should ever have eaten of the forbidden fruit. But as it was placed at first in Paradise, to be their Shibboleth of triall, so ever after it should have continued as a Symbol onely of their obedience. Again, by this my opinion, *That all Adams issue should have been confirmed in his confirmation*, Gods justice is defended from aspersions cast upon it, for damning some little children for the sinne of Adam, which sinne they did neither commit nor could avoid. And the fault of not avoiding it was no way arising from them, because they who can not avoid certain damnation by Adam, might also have received as certain salvation by him, without their own victorie over any temptation, which could not be, unless by his confirmed innocency every one of his issue had been confirm'd in grace. Anselmus cometh home to my thoughts, saying thus, * *The first man yeelding to the temptation have subjected all mankinde that was to be born of him, to the necessitie of sinne. Therefore if they had overcome that temptation, they had both themselves been presently confirmed in righteousnes by the merit of that victorie, and had also transmitted to the whole posteritie the same benefit of confirmed righteousnes.* Estius answereth Anselm thus, *The way is easier to the necessity of evill, then of good, as to recover health, rather then to establish health.* I reply thus on Estius, That his instances are in decaied nature, which reach not to our point, That the way was equally alike at first to Adam, or rather easier to goodnes, in which he was, then to fall in which he was not yet, in this our present infeebled estate, one habitually grounded in vertue shall finde the passage over unto sinne more difficult, perplexing, thorny, and laborious, then the continuing in goodnes. Out of Scotus his doctrine let me observe three points. First, he confesseth * *All their children had kept their righteousnes, not because they could not have kept it.* So they could have sinned, but should not, in his opinion. But are not they confirm'd, who though they could sinne, yet should not be suffered to sinne? Secondly, this confirmation in grace, being a supernaturall gift, had not been transfused by Adam, but

* *Statim post unum actum charitate informatum Angelus beatus fuit.* Aquin. part. 1. quæst. 62. art. 5.

* *Primi hominis succumbentes tentationi, totum genus humanum ex ipso nascituram subjecerunt necessitati peccati. Quæ, si eam tentationem superassent; & ipsi statim illius victoria meriti fuissent in justitia confirmati, & idem confirmatæ justitiæ beneficium ad totam posteritatem transmisissent.* Anselm. lib. 2. Cur Deus homo. cap. 18.

* *Omnes nati servassent justitiam, non quia non servare non potuissent.*

but superaddled by God unto every one, as well as the gift of originall justice and grace. I should have asked no more of Scotus, if he had said it should have been given to us of God, not for our personall vanquishing the first temptation, but for our obedience in Adam, according to Gods compact with him. Thirdly, confirmation in grace is of two sorts, one fitting to the state of a *Comprehensor*, or of supreme glorification. This confirmation at its height and in its excellence, nor Adam himself, if he had stood, nor his innocent issue should have had, till their terrene bodies had been translated into spirituall. The other confirmation agreeth with a *Viator*, which is not without a possibilitie of sinne, but having infallible custodie, that he shall not sinne mortally. *This* (saith Scotus, and the Scholium on him) *Adams innocent issue should have had.* But could they, being confirm'd, have sinned venially? Let me adde two speculations more. First, God could not make a creature in which there should not sometime be a peccabilitie, since that is a propertie onely of the Almightie. If that tying of Gods hand seem harsh to any unconversant in the Schools, I mitigate it thus, by the like instance out of * Scaliger; *When unto any thing God by his infinite powerfull perfection doth adde perfection, he must at last surcease from bettering it, and come to* NE PLUS ULTRA: *for he cannot make* ENS ASSENTIÆ INFINITÆ, *a thing of infinite essence, for he should make another God. Which words you must not understand, as if we stinted Gods Almightie power, but rather thus, That God can always better any thing, even to infinitie, but the creature and thing it self is not susceptible of that infinitie; the imperfection resting not in God, but in the creature.* To that effect Scaliger: and it may be aptly applied to the making of a creature simply impeccable. Secondly, God did make Adam with a full free-will, and a power to sinne or not to sinne. Our will was in his; and, without offence to the Schools, as in him we were in a sort, and in one kinde *Viatores*, before his fall; so if he had stood, wee had been, as he himself should, in a lesser degree, *Comprehensores*. For though Aquine maketh but simply single one confirmation in grace, yet Scotus maketh a twofold confirmation: and though Scotus saith, *Viator & Comprehensor distinguntur, sicut esse circa terminum & esse in termino*, yet there is a just distinction between *Esse in termino completo*, & *esse in termino incompleto*. Christ in some sense may be said to have been both *Viator* and *Comprehensor*. If Adam had been confirmed ere he fell, he had been in some degree *Comprehensor*: so had we, and yet both he and we should have been in some sort *Viatores in termino incompleto*, as not having obtained life unchangeable, and bodies spirituall, which was to be the completorie perfection of humane blisse. More arguments might I use, but they may be gathered in the answers unto the objections before cited.

* Scal. Exercit. 249. in fine.

And

And first, the great S. Auguſtine hath many obſervable paſſages to this point. First, *That onely Adam was made of earth: that this gradation is not required, namely, that he ſhould be firſt created a childe, then become a youth, then a man*, De Geneſ. ad literam 6. 13. And in the Chapter following, * *Adam is thought to have been made in mans age, without any growth or further increaſe.* And more reſolvedly, De peccatorum Merit. & Remiſſ. 2. 27.* *As for the quantitie of body, Adam was not made little, but of a perfect bigneſſe of members.* Secondly, in the laſt cited place Auguſtine maketh this Quære, *If Adam and Eve had not ſinned, Whether their young children ſhould have been able to go, ſpeak, or the like?* And he anſwereth, *Perhaps it was neceſſarie they ſhould be born little, according to the capacitie of the wombe: but as God made Eve no little woman of a little rib, ſo the omnipotent Creator might have made their little children newly born, preſently to be great: Even many beaſts, a while after they are born, runne and follow after their dammes; much more might he have done for men, and given them even preſent uſe of their members.* Thirdly, though Lombard rather inclineth to them who ſay, that the new-born children of innocent Adam ſhould have growen by degrees, and not have been preſently able to exerciſe their limmes: though accordingly he inclineth to them, who think that thoſe innocent infants upon their birth ſhouſd have had little ſenſe or underſtanding, but by time ſhould acquire proficiencie and perfection; yet I rather imagine, they ſhould preſently upon their birth have had perfect uſe of body and minde, (though I deny not experimentall augmentations) both becauſe there is a nearer reſemblance unto Adam, who was ſo created, and a further diſtance & diſſimilitude from the eſtate of our corrupted nature, which creepeth *ſenſim, pedetentim, & gradatim*, by little and little, and is incompetent to the perfection of innocencie. Yea Eſtius himſelf fighteth againſt Lombards diſcourſe, and ſaith, *Innocent Adams children ſhould have had uſe of reaſon from their very nativitie, and perhaps even in their mothers wombe ſhould have had ſome ſmall knowledge of God*: and confirmeth his opinion by Auguſtine De peccat. Merit. & Remiſſ. lib. 1. Cap. 36. & lib. 2. Cap. 29. and Confeſſ. 1. 7. and De Civit. 22. 22. *Where* (ſaith he) *Auguſtine ſpeaketh not of an habituall knowledge onely, but of the act and uſe of knowledge.* Therefore if Auguſtine were not to be expounded, as he is by Halenſis, of confirmation in obedience upon the firſt temptation; yet they will get little footing by that learned Fathers authoritie, if they wil weigh one place with an other, which are hereafter to be cited out of him; to which, that I may ſhorte this point, I refer you.

I come now unto Eſtius, who had his firſt reaſon from Aquine & Scotus. *Adam & Eve* (ſay they) *had not begotten children in a better condition then themſelves were created by God; there-*

* *Creditur factus Adam virili ætate, ſine ullo progreſſu incrementorum.*

* *Quod pertinet ad corporis quantitatem, Adam non factus eſt parvulus, ſed perfectâ mole membrorum.*

fore they ſhould have begot juſt children, but not confirmed in grace. Firſt, I anſwer, that though God made all things very good at the creation, yet he might after (if he would) and may yet (if he will) make things better then they were at the creation. Secondly, *Stapleton quoteth this from Auguſtine, *The firſt man did receive a more pleaſant grace, we a more powerfull.* Neither doth Whitaker diſlike this, though he confute much of that Chap. of Stapleton: Now, if we in this forlorn eſtate have more powerfull grace then Adam, why not in that eſtate? Thirdly, though the children of innocent Adam might have more grace intenſively then he, yet Adam had had more extenſively: for his righteouſnes had benefitted the whole World, theirs had redounded but to their own perſons. Fourthly, let us take a more diſtinct view of their ſeverall gifts. Adam receiveth originall juſtice, to ſtand (if he would) for himſelf and the whole World: his iſſue receive by his ſtanding this grace more then he had at firſt, (though he had it before he begot them) that they cannot fall by themſelves as he might. As for this, that their children ſhould not fall, but that all their generation ſhould have been confirmed in grace, it proceedeth not from their immediate parents, but from Adam as the root. Now then, weigh in a balance theſe two graces together (which the Schoolmen neglected) certainly the grace given unto Adam was (all things conſidered) more powerfull, more abundant. As if God ſhould give, in preſent poſſeſſion, unto one man enough of worldly wealth, to ſerve ſufficiently, yea abundantly for himſelf and his ſeed for ever, if he would huſband it well. Secondly, if after this God ſhould ſuperadde unto his ſonne, this gift more then he gave unto the father at firſt, namely, this grace, that he ſhould not have power to diminiſh this wealth, for ſo much as concerned his own perſon; which of theſe two, the father or the ſonne, had the greater gift? I doubt not but *Calculator* would hold, that the father had. Again, if Adā had begot children before ever he had ſeen the tree of good and evill, as was poſſible, he had begot children as himſelf was created, juſt, but unconfirmed. The concluſion of *Aquine, or extracted out of Aquine, is unworthie of him, and ſo are his own words, * *So long as the parents had begotten, they had not been confirmed in juſtice: for hence is a reaſonable creature confirmed in juſtice, that it is made happy by the open ſight of God.* I anſwer, that the beatificall viſion is the complement, perfection, and boundarie of all confirmation in juſtice: but there may be a kinde of confirmation in juſtice without the beatificall, preſent, apert viſion of God, or ſuch as ſhall be in the ſtate glorified. For ſince Aquine there confeſſeth, *That the thrice holy Mother of our Holieſt All-holy Saviour might by eſpeciall priviledge generate, and yet enjoy the apert viſion of God*, I ſee not why Adam and

*Stapl. *De Peccato Originali* lib. 1. cap. 15. * *Primus homo letiorem, nos potentiorem gratiam accepimus.*

*Aquin part. 1. quæſt. 100. art. 2. In corpore articuli. *Parentes quandiu generáſſent, non fuiſſent confirmati in juſtitia: ex hoc enim creatura rationalis in juſtitia confirmatur, quòd efficitur beata per apertam Dei viſionem.*

and Eve continuing innocent might not do the like, or beget children confirmed in grace, and yet generate; which he denieth. Because the supposed priviledge of the All-gracious Virgin doth not derogate from the glorie of our most blessed Redeemer, I will not contradict it, though it maketh her more perfect then God made Adam and Eve in their integritie. Lastly, why might not generating parents be confirmed in grace, when in the act there should have been no turpitude, no salacious motion, no lascivious titillation; and those members might have been used without any itch of ticklish pleasure, as our hands and feet and some other parts are now? Reade S. Augustine *De Civit.* 14. 24. and 26. most fully of these things. Unto Estius his second reason, which is this, *Angels were not ordained to blessednes, but by the merit of their free-will; and man was not first to be placed at the goal or end, but in the way.* I answer, Every Angel was to stand or fall by his own proper actuall free-will. Man was unlike to them therein; Adams actuall consent for us, stood exactly for the actuall consent of each Angel; for no Angel fell in Lucifer, as we did in Adam. But to the second branch of his argument, I confesse with Aquine,* *The soul of man and an Angel are alike ordained to blessednes.* The way was necessarie before the goal, the means before the end. But I must adde, Adam was in the way, and we in the way by him and in him: and as he brought us out of the way by his straying by-path, so by his undeviation we had been kept in the way. More might be added, but the Question hath swollen above its banks already. I must be brief, though I be obscure.

What Hugo and Lombard require, was performed by Adam for us. Though Estius in this point maketh God like an hard task-master, and man a meer journy-man; yet much was given to him who deserved little; even for one onely, and the easiest houres work. So might God have done to us for his promise unto Adams obedience for us. In that estate, perhaps, he needed no merit challenging due reward; as there shall be no new recompense for desert, after we are glorified. But if merit had had place, it might after confirmation in grace have procured speedier translation to an unchangeable life; & the accidentals of beatitude might have been increased in us, as they shall be in the Angels of light, though long since they were confirmed in grace.

Scotus objecteth, *The children of innocent Adam should have been Viatores, in the way to happines; therefore they might have been sinners.* I answer, *Viator* is considered according to a twofold estate. First, for him that walketh in a slippery and dangerous way, where he may be *in* or out. Thus was Adam *Viator*, thus were we *Viatores* in Adam before his fall, and thus we could have sinned, yea did sinne; which is more

* Anima hominis & Angelus similiter ad beatitudinem ordinatur.

more then Scotus his argument evinceth. Secondly, *Viator* is taken according to the estate of him who walketh in a good sure way, where no by-path can be made. Thus we being confirmed should have been *Viatores*, and yet could not have been sinners; and herein we had been like to blessed Angels; yea the same man might have been *Viator* in one regard, and *Comprehensor* in an other respect at the same time. So was Christ, so had Adam and his children been upon confirmation in goodnes; not that they should have had that plenitude of comprehension which is to be enjoyed after the generall judgement, but such a comprehension which had been agreeable to that present estate, (though susceptible of degrees, and capable of more perfection) where *Comprehensor* is synonymous with *beatus* onely, but not *beatissimus*. The same Scotus further reasoneth thus:

The grace confirmed by the Merit of Christ in Baptisme, or other Sacraments confirm not the receiver;
Therefore much lesse should any Merit of any parent or childe have confirmed us in justice.

I answer, The confirmation had rather been from Gods gracious promise to Adam and his seed, then from any merit properly so called. Secondly, The graces of Christ exhibited in the Sacraments of initiation and corroboration shall draw us up to an infallible confirmation in the estate of glorie; where we shall have more comfort, delight, and good by Christ, then we had harm by Adam, if he had not fallen: of which hereafter.

To some arguments and authorities for my opinion, some answers are shaped by the Schoolmen. I will loose the argument from S. Gregorie, because it ingendereth more questions, when this is too copiously handled already.

Anselm speaketh home for me, if ever man spake; Aquinas saith, *He did it opining, not affirming*: Yet he saw the reason which induced Anselm to that Assertion. Scotus also slubbereth over the authoritie of Anselm, winking, as it seemeth, when he should have read the direct words. * Dionysius saith, *Bonum est potentius malo: Good hath more power and vertue then evill.* But (say I) for the sinne of the first man came a necessitie of sinning upon all his children; Therefore if he had stood, there should have been a necessitie of not sinning. Scotus answereth in the first place, as if Dionysius were to be understood *of a great Evill, and a little Good*, which plainely that Father never meant. Secondly, he jumpeth in sense with Aquine, and both do answer, *That we are not so necessitated to sinning, that we can not return to justice, and Adams sinne was not cause of our confirmation in evill.* I reply, we are so necessitated by our nature, that of our selves and from our selves we can not return to justice. We are obstinate and confirmed in evill, in regard of our own disabi-

* Dion. *De Divinis Nominibus* cap. 4.

disabilities, though not confirmed in evill, nor obstinate, if we consider the powerfull mercy of God. And this is enough to make the argument hold good. There should have been a necessitie of not sinning of our part, otherwise, *Evill should have been more powerfull then Good*, which is the contradictorie to Dionysius. For we can not but sinne of our selves, and are obstinate; though we are not so obstinate as the damned, nor should have been so confirmed by Adam as the glorified shall be.

Unto our argument drawn from the similitude of Angelicall reward, Aquinas answereth, *Men and Angels are not alike.* I reply, We were both like in some things, and unlike in other: but in this we had been like, That as the Angels were confirmed presently upon their first obedience, so had Adam been confirmed, and we in him. For God loved not Man worse then the Angels, *For Christ verily took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham*, Heb. 2.16. Scotus yeeldes himself captive to the force of this reason, save onely that he opineth, That every one of Adams children should, as well as Adam, have been confirmed in grace, upon their actuall overcoming of the first temptation suggested unto them; whereas I maintain, That Adams representation of us, and his obedience, should have done as much good, to our resisting of the first temptation.

More might pertinently be said of this matter: but besides the precedent tediousnesse of it, Ludovicus Vives *autem vellit*, endeavouring to restrain such speculations to modest bounds. Thus he saith on Augustine *De Civit.* 13.1. *Of things which might, or might not have happened to man, if Adam had not fallen; *What fell out, to our great harm, no man is ignorant of: what should have befallen, I know not whether it was revealed to Adam himself; how much lesse to us poore wretches? For what availeth it to use conjectures, in a thing which is above all humane conjectures?* But Vives himself is to blame. First, for his nesciencie, or timerousnesse; as if Adam knew not, what estate he and his should have had, if he had persevered in innocency. The ignorance of a point so nearely concerning him, had argued imperfection; which the fulnes of knowledge, in which he was created, did clearly dispell. For if God said to the corrupted World, Deut. 30.19. *I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you Life and Death*, could uncorrupt Adam be ignorant of the life that was set before him? Or did Adam understand the miseries and punishments, the orts and effects of *Morte Morieris*, expressely threatned against him, in a future contingent estate; and could he be ignorant of his present condition of blisse, and certain blisse to be increased upon his obedience? Did he know the natures of beasts, and other creatures; could he know the strange production of Eve, could he prophetically

* *Quid factum sit, magno nostro malo, nemo ignorat; quid fuisset, nescio an ipsi Adam est certum fuit; quanto minus nobis miselli? Nam quid prodest uti conjecturis, in re quæ conjecturas omnes superat humanas?*

phetically intimate the strict union of Christ with his Church, by his own conjunction with Eve, and was it not shewed unto him, what state he should have had, and one in him? Secondly, though these things be taxed of nicetie, yet the impartiall Reader, overviewing this Book, perhaps will say, It was profitable and delightfull to problematize even upon this very point. But other matters invite me hence forward to them; and therefore having cleared, That it was the sinne of Adam, of onely Adam, and not of Eve, for which Death was appointed, Let us proceed to examine, Which and what this sinne of Adam was; which is next and necessarily to be handled.

O Most glorious Creator, who didst make us in the First Adam excellent Creatures, and wouldst have made us better, if he who undertook for us, had not brought upon us death and destruction, Grant, I beseech thee, for thy mercies sake, in the Merit and Mediation of the Second Adam, Jesus Christ our onely Saviour, That we may recover our lost Image, and be made like unto him here, and reigne in Life with him hereafter.

CHAP. III.

1. *Adams perfection in innocencie. Our imperfection after his fall, even here in both in understanding and will, and in the parts concupiscible and irascible.*

2. *Adam had other lawes given him: but one above all, and one onely concerning posterity.*

3. *What this Law was. Adam knew the danger to himself and his offspring. The first sinne was against this Law.*

4. *Eve sinned before. How she sinned the same, and not the same sinne with Adam.*

5. *Zeno, the Stoicks, and Jovinian censured. Sinnes are not equally sinfull.*

6. *Adam sinned farre more and worse then Eve.*

7. *This sinne of Adam was not incontinencie, as Scotus maintained, but disobedience or pride. The branches of Adams sinne.*

1. LOmbard saith, *Some are of opinion that Adam before the fall had no vertue.* He had not justice (say they) because he despised Gods commandement; nor prudence, because he provided not for himself; nor temperance, for his appetite extended to the forbidden fruit; nor fortitude, for he yeelded to suggestion. *We answer*, saith Lombard, *He had not these vertues when he sinned, but before, and in sinning lost them.* For Augustine in a certain Homily saith, *Adam was made according to the Image of God, adorned with sinnelessenesse, compassed with temperance, splendent with charitie.* Otherwhere he saith, *Adam was endued with a spirituall mind.* Ambrose saith, *He was most happy, and led an heavenly life*; and addeth a good observation, *When Adam was alone, he transgressed not.* Which may teach us to fear the enticements of companie. This point deserveth not to be so speedily cast off: and therefore attend this further enlargement.

Many, very many precepts were graven in the heart of Adam, and every branch of the naturall Law was there written by the finger of God, at his Creation; nor was he ignorant, what was to be done or omitted in any businesse. Eccl. 17. 1. *The Lord created man of the earth:* and verse 2. he changeth the

* *Quibusdam videtur quòd Adam ante lapsum non habuerit virtutes.* Lomb. Sent 2. dist. 29. lit. B.

* *Beatissimus erat, & eorum carpebat ubertatem.*

* *Quando Adam solus erat, non est prævaricatus.*

singular into the plural, *He gave them power over the things thereon*; and verse 3. *He endued them with strength by themselves, and made them according to his image*: And then followeth an excellent description of their gifts. I conceive, and explain the matter thus: Foure faculties he had, and we have of our soule, { Two superior. Two inferiour.

The two superior are understanding and will; The two inferior, the part irascible and part concupiscible. First, the object of his understanding was truth, the perfection of it was knowledge: but now, as we are in the state decaied, this truth is darkned with ignorance, 1 Corinth. 2. *The naturall man receiveth not, nor can know the things of the Spirit of God.* Eph. 4. 18. *Their understanding is darkned, and their hearts are blinde.* Psal. 49. 20. *Man in honour understandeth not.* As Adam was in innocencie, he was partaker of the truth. The Apostle, Ephes. 4. 23, 24. saith, *Be renewed in the spirit of your minde.* Now we were once in Adam, and in him also we grew old: we are commanded to be renewed as new as once we were; and *put on the new man, which was created in righteousnesse and holinesse of truth*, therefore the first Adam was created in truth. You have the object, *Truth*; the perfection was *Knowledge*, Ecclesiasticus 17. 7. *God filled them with knowledge and understanding*: and this is seconded by the Apostle, Colos. 3. 10. *The new man is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him.* Renovation necessarily implieth precedent oldnes; and oldnes, precedent newnes of knowledge in the first Adam. Secondly, the object of mans will, was, and is, *Goodnesse*; the perfection, *Love*. In the decayed estate the will is infected with *vanitie*, Genes. 6. 5. *Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was onely evill continually.* Ephes. 4. 17. *We walk in the vanitie of our minde.* In the state of integritie it was farre otherwise: Adam was new in his minde, and holy and righteous, as was proved before: in which regard * Chrysostom saith, *Adam was a terrestriall Angel.* *Basil reckoneth up, as Adams chief good in Paradise, *His sitting with God, and conjunction by love.* As all things els, so Adams will was good, and tended unto good; there is the object: his love in innocencie was entire, and united to God; there was his perfection. Thirdly, the object of his, and our part concupiscible, is moderate delight: the perfection and felicitie of it, was contentment. As now, this part is gauled with insatiable itchings, and *given over to lasciviousnesse, to work all uncleannesse with greedines*, Ephes. 4. 19. But at the first Adam was free. Augustine saith, *There the grace of God was great, where an earthy and sensuall body had no beastly lust.* The place he was in, was a Paradise of pleasure, a garden of delight; nothing was wanting which might give true content. Fourthly, the object of his and our irascible part may in a sort be called *Difficulty*, or rather *Constancy*;

* Chrys. Hom. 16. in Gen.

* Bas. Homil. *Quòd Deus non sit author malorum.*

* *Gratia Dei ibi magna erat, ubi terrenum & animale corpus bestialem libidinem non habebat.*

ſtancy, whoſe glory of endeavours, end, and felicitie, was *Victorie*. This part now is much weakned with infirmitie. In the beſt of us, the Fleſh luſteth againſt the Spirit; and (alas!) we are often vanquiſhed, as being weak by nature: But Adam was ſtrong, and could have overcome any temptation. Auguſtine ſaith, * *Our firſt parents were happy, being neither ſhaken with any trouble of minde, nor hurt with any infirmitie of body.* * *Adam had no need of that help which theſe crave, when they ſay, I ſee another law in my members, &c.* Yea he is more bold there, ſaying, * *Adam in thoſe good things wherein he was created, had no need of Chriſts death.* He had, with libertie and will, grace ſufficient, whereby he might have triumphed over all difficulties and temptations. Auguſtine thus, * *In Paradiſe before ſinne although Adam could not do all things, yet he then would not do whatſoever he could not, and therefore could do all that he would.* Adam having theſe excellent endowments of nature and grace, had alſo neceſſarily certain objects, about which they ſhould be converſant. Theſe objects were, all the parts, and branches of the Law of nature, whereby he fully knew his dutie. And all and every one of theſe he did for a while, or at the leaſt not break: and he and his poſteritie ſhould, and ought to fulfill, as they were private perſons: and for the performance and non-performance thereof, both he and we ſhould, and ſhall anſwer unto God, at the high Throne and Tribunall of the juſt and righteous Judge.

2. But there was one precept, and onely one, given to Eve, (perhaps to all Adams poſteritie, as private perſons: who, if they had eaten of the tree of knowledge of good and evill, can not be imagined, that they could have ruinated all mankinde:) but commanded to Adam onely, as the publick perſon, as the Idea of humane nature, as the ſtock and root, by whoſe obedience or diſobedience all mankinde was to be happie or unhappie, as the figure of Chriſt to come. And this ſin was not to be a ſin of thought onely, as the ſin of the Angels, who each of them ſinned by his own expreſſed will; but ſuch a ſinne, as might bring a deſerved blot, and puniſhment upon all his poſteritie, who were in him: which could not be, unles it had been committed both by his ſoul and his body, and thereby had power to infect all the parts, and faculties both of ſouls and bodies. Again, the body of Adam could not ſinne without the ſoul, neither could this be a ſinne of the ſoul alone, without ſome concurrents of the bodily parts; for then Adams ſinning ſoul ſhould have been damned, and his innocent bodie ſaved: but it was to be a ſinne compounded of inward averſion and outward tranſgreſſion. So that if Adam had ſeen Eve eat, and had himſelf luſted after the fruit, and yet before the orall manducation had diſliked his liking, had feared the puniſhment, and

* *Felices tenuit primi homines, nullis agitabantur perturbationibus animorum, nullis corporis ledebantur incommodis.* De Civit. 14. 10.

* *Adam non opus habebat eo adjutorio quod implorant iſti, cum dicunt, Video aliam legem in membris meis,* &c. Lib. De Corrept. & Gratia.

* *Adam in illis bonis, in quibus creatus eſt Chriſti; morte non equit.* Ibid.

* *In Paradiſo etiamſi omnia non poterat Adam ante peccatum, quicquid tum non poterat non volebat, & ideo poterat omnia quæ volebat.* De Civit. 14. 13.

and not proceeded to *eat* of it, or *touch* it, I do not think his posteritie had been engaged, as they are. Augustine citeth this out of S. Ambrose, and approveth it, * *If Adams soul had bridled the bodily appetite in the very beginning, the originall of sinne had been quenched.*

* *Si avima Adami appetentiam corporis refrenâsset in ipso ortu, extincta esset origo peccati.* Cont. Julian. Pelag. lib. 2.

Catharinus thinketh there was an expresse covenant between God and Adam, that Adam and his posteritie should be blessed or cursed, according to the breaking or keeping of that one law. What Catharinus saith is probable, and may be most true, though it be not so written. For first, if the prohibition had concerned Adams person onely, since the precept was given before Eve was created, Adam onely should have tasted of death, and not Eve. Secondly, questionlesse that law and covenant included posteritie, as is verified in the event. When *Morte Morieris* was threatned unto Adam, he was then *Rectus in Curia*, and stood as a publique person, representing all his branches. If it concerned him, as a private person, he onely should personally have died, and we escaped: but our dying in him evinceth, that he was reputed (if I may so say) a generall, universall feoffee, or person, to whose freewill the happie or unhappie future estate of all his descendants was intrusted; conditionally, to live for ever, upon the observance of one law; or to die the death, for the breach of it. Life and death was propounded, † *Not to one man, but to all mankinde.*

† *Non uni, sed universitati.*

3. And this law is registred, and recorded, Genes. 2.17. *Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evill thou shalt not eat; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* Which words I verily beleeve that Adam understood (either by his naturall wisedome, which was very great, or by divine conference or revelation, which to him was not unfrequent) to involve his posteritie as well as himself. For if immediatly upon the creation of woman, Adam could foresee and propheſie, Genes. 2.24. *That a man shall leave his Father and Mother, and cleave to his wife; and they two shall be one flesh*: and by the same words, perhaps, understand Christ and his Church, and that mysterie explained by S. Paul, Ephes. 5.31, &c. (those being the words of Adam, as † Epiphanius saith, of Adam speaking unto God, speaking the truth of God; and in this respect (as I conceive) Christ saith, Matth. 19.4, &c. these words are the words of God, of the Creator; as all light is from the Sunne, so all truth from God; as on the contrarie, all lies are from the Devill) I say, if Adam could foresee marriages, generations, cohabitations, mysteries, and future usances; he could not be ignorant, that that law was given him to keep to the blisse of all mankinde, and the contempt thereof would draw on the destruction of his posteritie. And (I think) I shall not erre, if I collect from the correlative correspondencie, which must be between the Type and

† Epiph. *Contra Ptolemaitas.*

and the Antitype, the ſhadow and the ſubſtance, That the firſt Adam knew his παρακοὴ or diſobedience was ſufficient to bring deſtruction on all mankinde, as the ſecond Adam knew that his ὑπακοὴ or obedience, was a ſufficient redemption for the ſinnes of all the World. Durand fooliſhly preſuppoſeth, that the will of Adam ſinning was ours onely *commitativè & interpretativè*, becauſe we loſt originall juſtice, when Adam ſinned, beyond his thoughts or intentions. * Stapleton ſaith truly, *If Adam intended no ſuch thing with an actuall intention, yet he did it with a virtuall intention.* But I rather think, that the word *If* may be cut off, and we may ſay, Adam did, as Eſau afterward, prefer temporals before ſpirituals, and as all the ſonnes of Adam do at one time or other; for he was not ignorant of the danger, yet embraced it: and he might ſay within himſelf, — *Video meliora, probóque, Deteriora ſequor*---- * Auguſtine hath this wittie *Quære, Whether Adam and Eve foreknew their fall?* For if he did before hand know that he ſhould ſinne, and that God would revenge it, whence could he be happie? and ſo he was in Paradiſe, yet not happie. If he did not foreknow his fall; then by this ignorance he was either uncertain of that bleſſedneſſe; and how was he then truly bleſſed? or certain by a falſe hope, and not by a right knowledge; and then how was he not a fool? I anſwer, They did not know that they ſhould fall, or ſinne; for there was no neceſſitie laid upon them; and to know the unalterable certaintie of a thing contingent (as their future eſtate was) is to take away the nature of its contingencie, and to make it unavoidable. But for all this ignorance, they were certain enough of bleſſedneſſe, if they would themſelves; and their wills and perſons were in Paradiſe bleſſed, though changeable, though not ſo wholy bleſſed as good Angels are, or as the Saints ſhall be. For if we ſay, Nothing is bleſſed but what hath attained abſolute certainty, and the height of bleſſedneſſe; the very bleſſed Spirits of heaven ſhall not be ſaid to be bleſſed, eſpecially if they be compared with God, who onely is bleſſed. And ſo Adam and Eve were *beati modò quodam inferiori, non tamen nullo*, that I anſwer in Auguſtines words. Again, to the former part of this Queſtion I anſwer, That they knew before hand that they could ſinne, and that God would puniſh them, if they did ſinne, and yet for all this, they had the grace given to ſtand, if they would, and ſo to avoid both ſinne and puniſhment; and withall they knew that they had that grace. But if before hand they had known, or could have known that they ſhould have ſinned, they could not have been happie in Paradiſe, yet, as they were in Paradiſe, they were happie, though they knew not that they ſhould fall. For if men on earth may be called *Saints, Saints of light, Bleſſed*, (as they are often) and *Spirituall*, Galat. 6. 1. though they were in their bodies

* Stap. *De Originali Peccato* l. 9.

* Aug. De Gen. ad lit. l. 11. 18.

bodies to paſſe through both temptations and tribulations, and can not divers times but fall: much more Adam might be termed *Bleſſed* in Paradiſe; who though he ſaw he might fall, yet he ſaw alſo he might have ſtood; *and ſo rejoyced*, ſaith Auguſtine himſelf, *for the reward to come, that he endured no tribulation for the preſent*. Laſtly, to S. Auguſtines three-headed *Dilemma* I anſwer by diſtinguiſhing. There is a threefold ignorance: The firſt is *pravæ diſpoſitionis*, when one is prepoſſeſſed with a falſe opinion, excluding knowledge: this may be called *poſitive ignorance*, or *plain errour*. The ſecond is *ignorantia privationis*, when a man knoweth not what he is bound to know: neither of theſe can conſiſt with bleſſedneſſe, nor was in innocent Adam. But there is a third, viz. *ignoratio ſimplicis neſcientiæ*, when we know not ſuch things as we need not to know. This was in Adam, and is in good Angels: yea Chriſt himſelf knew not ſome things. This ignorance is not ſinfull; nor erronious, not making either imaginarily happie, or fooliſh.

This great law, in Tertullians phraſe is ſtiled * *The Mother-law, breeding all other laws: which had been ſufficient for them, if they had kept it*, ſaith he. * Auguſtine and * Chryſoſtom agree in this, *That Adams firſt ſinne onely maketh us culpable.* * Chryſoſtom calleth it πρώτην ἁμαρτίαν. *The firſt ſinne.* Auguſtin ſaith that * *Onely the firſt tranſgreſſion of Adam is paſſed upon the poſteritie, becauſe the whole nature is corrupted by that firſt ſinne.* Therefore when a childe is born, he hath originall ſinne, and death the wages thereof annexed as due to it; not becauſe he is a creature, not becauſe he is a perſon, not becauſe he is a perſon of mankinde or humane nature, not becauſe he deſcended from his immediate or mediate parents, not becauſe they came from Eve, not onely becauſe he was in the loyns of Adam, of ſinning or ſinfull Adam; but becauſe he was in Adam when he firſt ſinned, and implicitly gave his conſent to the committing of that firſt tranſgreſſion, and that primarie averſion which hath led us aſtray ever ſince.

4. Some have held, that Eve ſinned before ſhe talked with the Serpent. So * Rupertus and * Ferus. But certainly ſhe ſinned before Adam, & being carried headlong with the *Bonũ apparens*, did little imagine to work ſo much miſchief. Had ſhe known that her huſbands yeelding ſhould neceſſarily and infallibly bring forth death to him and all his poſteritie, and after that have offered him the forbidden fruit, ſhe had been full of deceit, and her intentions had been ſtained with the juſt aſperſion of ſeducement. But ſhe might think her ſinne was little or none, and perſwade herſelf ſhe ſhould not die, and relate that perſwaſion to her huſband; or think onely of Gods mercy, who had never taſted of his judgements. And, perhaps, he ſeeing that ſhe had touched the fruit, and was not dead, ſunk under her

*Lex primordialis, generalis, & quaſi matrix omnium præceptorum Dei.
*Aug. De Civit. 14. 12
*Chryſ. Homil. 41. in Acta Apoſt.
† Chryſ. in Epheſ. 6.
*Prima duntaxat Adæ tranſgreſſio tranſit in poſteros, quia illo primo peccato univerſa natura corrupta eſt. Cont. Julian. 3. 6.

*Rup. lib. 3. *De Operib. Trinit.* in Gen. cap. 5.
* Ferus in Gen. 3.

her enticements, and did eat. Before I part with this point, two queſtions more muſt needs be anſwered. Firſt, Whether Eve ſinned the ſame ſinne with Adam? Secondly, Whether of their ſinnes were the greateſt? Concerning the firſt, I anſwer, In regard that both of them knew, that to eat of the forbidden fruit was unlawfull and diſpleaſing to God, and yet did eat, they ſinned the ſame ſinne: but as the commandment was given to Adam before Eves creation, as Adam was the root of mankinde, and as his poſterity was to ſtand or fall in him onely, and not in Eve, ſo ſhe ſinned not the ſame ſinne with Adam. She ſinned the ſame ſinne, in reſpect of the outward eating, not in regard of the inward obligation: She ſinned the ſame *ſin in ſe*, ſo much as concerned her own perſon; ſhe ſinned not the ſame ſinne *extenſivè erga alios*. For as her good actions, conſidered by themſelves, ſhould not have been the rule or ſquare according to which our humane natures ſhould have been framed; (but for all her uprightnes, if Adam had ſinned we had died) ſo her ſinne or ſinnes, ſetting Adam apart, had not extended to the corruption or deſtruction of mankinde.

Though in innocencie they did ſee much, yet they could then ſee no deformitie: nay, though Eve had ſinned, and ſinned divers ſinnes before Adam ſinned any; (for ſhe beleeved the Serpent, diſtruſted God, fell to unlawfull deſires, and did eat) yet they were both blinde: and neither Eve herſelf did conſider her own faults, as ſhe ſhould, nor Adam Eves faults; but immediately, ſo ſoon as Adam had eaten, Geneſ. 3.7. *The eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked.* For their nakednes came by Adams ſinne, and not by Eves; the ſame ſinne of hers and his was not the ſame; neither Adam, nor we, nor ſhe herſelf by her ſinnes were bare and naked of goodnes, or had loſt *Bonum naturæ*, but onely *gratiæ perſonalis*: but when once he had ſinned, he, ſhe, and we were all naked, our natures corrupt and to be aſhamed of; and both of them knew it. *Their eyes opened themſelves*; ſo Tremellius hath it, differing from the Hebrew and the Septuagint. The truth is, ſhe ſinned the ſame ſinne twice, for ſhe ate firſt by herſelf, and then her eyes were not opened. *Neither was ſhe ſpoiled of originall juſtice* (ſaith Franciſcus Aretinus) *as it was gratia gratis data, nor did ſhe feel the motions of concupiſcence, or knew her own nakednes, till Adam had ſinned. For if ſhe had been deprived of grace ſo ſoon as ſhe ſinned, ſhe ſhould have been aſhamed of her nakednes; neither durſt ſhe to have gone naked to her huſband, but for modeſtie would have ſought ſome covering, or fled into corners.* So farre Aretinus, or Cornelius à Lapide who citeth him. But after this her eating and this her ſinne, ſhe cometh to her huſband, and offereth him ſome to eat, and eateth with him the ſecond time; and perchance began to eat the ſecond time ere he ate once, and

suffered him to see her eat. Sure I am, the Hebrew runneth thus, *She did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat*: but the 70 say of Eve first, καὶ ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς μετ' αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔφαγον. where they are peremptorie, that Adam and Eve, or rather Eve and Adam ate both together. And Vatablus well expoundeth the Saevm, *id est, vt una cum ipsa ederet*: and the proof is pertinent enough, though we do not reade with the Septuagint, *They did eat*, but with the Hebrew, *He did eat*, namely, with her, or, after he had seen her eat. The summe is, she ate first, she ate again with him, she sinned the same sinne. And further, though she sinned the same sinne the third time, in his eating and by it, aswell as we did, who also were in him *ratione principii*; yet was it not her sinne, but his sinne that overthrew both him, her, and us: and in this sense we may truly say, she sinned not the same sinne with Adam. So much for the first question. It cometh secondarilie to be enquired, *Whether Adams or Eves sinne was the greater.*

5. To say that no sinne is greater then other, is one of the grossest errors that have been. Me thinks a Stoick should be ashamed to say, that Nero, Heliogabalus, and the grand Epicure sinned not worse, then Cato the Utican, Aristides the Just, or Zeno the Cittien of Cyprus, the great upholder of their own sect: or that unmatchable Titus the Emperour, who lamented the day in which he did not good to some man, was no better then Timon *the Man-hater*. No other Philosophers ever joyned hands with them in that folly. **This of the equalitie of sinnes, the Stoicks onely have dared to dispute; for they did so against all the sense, feeling, and opinion of mankinde*, saith S. Augustin. Yet Jovinian sided with them; but S. Hierom confuted him, **Which opinion of theirs in that Jovinian, who in this tenent was a Stoick, but in pursuing and defending pleasures an Epicure, out of the sacred Scriptures thou hast most clearely convinced*, as S. Augustine in the same place testifieth of S. Hierom, to S. Hierom. The same in effect saith S. Hierom himself of himself, against Jovinian. †*We have crusht both by common sense and by divine Scripture the error of Jovinian, who would prove that there is no difference between just and just, a sinner and a sinner; and also the old opinion of Zeno.* And indeed, so he did in the same book, both by answering all Jovinians objections, and overlaying him with sound proofs. I omit whatsoever S. Hierom hath laboriously, acutely, and truly collected against the Stoicall equalitie of sinnes, and against Jovinians wilde inferences. Let him that thirsteth, have recourse to the fountain, in the said second book of S. Hierom against Jovinian: *Fons vincet sitientem.* Yet suffer me to cast my mite into the Treasurie. First, *Elenctice*, upon the by, then *Didactice*, on the main. Concerning the first; unto one of the witlesse positions of Jovinian, viz. †*We love equally all our*

* *Hoc de parilitate peccatorum soli Stoici ausi sunt disputare; nam sic fecerunt contra omnem sensum generis humani.* Aug. Epist. 29. Ad Hieronymum.

* *Quam eorum vanitatem, in Joviniano illo, qui in hac sententia Stoicus erat, in aucupandis autem & defensandis voluptatibus Epicureus, de Scripturis Sanctis dilucidissimè convicisti.*

† *Nullam inter justum & justum, peccatorem & peccatorem esse distantiam; veterémque Zenonis sententiam, tam communi sensu quàm divinâ lectione contrivimus* Hieron. Cont. Jovin. lib. 2.

our members, neither do we preferre the eye before the finger, nor the finger before the eare; by which he would inferre a parilitie of ſinnes, (beſides what S. Hierom excellently anſwereth) I can not chuſe but oppoſe what Moſes ſaith, Deuteron.32.10. *God kept the Iſraelites as the apple of his eye*, it being more guarded with the double coverlids of skins and hairs, and more curiouſly then any other outward part; which proverbiall ſimilitude, being alſo taken up both by David, Pſal.17.8. and by the Prophet Zecharie 2.8. ſignificantly intimateth, that one part of the body is more tender to us then any other. Neither needed there ſuch exact reraliation as is required Exod.21.24. *Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot*, if all members were of like worth: for a tooth might have been pluckt out for an eye, and the foot might have ſtood for the hand. Yea, whatſoever Jovinian opineth, or rather raveth, Dives being in torment had more regard to the cooling of his tongue, Luk. 16.24. then to the tip of his eare. *Where ſinne is, there is puniſhment alſo*, ſaith S. Chryſoſtom; *and Dives his tongue ſpake many proud things*, ſaith he: *and Dives was full of loquacitie*, as the Interlineary Gloſſe obſerveth even from his very ſpeech to Abraham: and perchance his tongue was moſt tortured, as having been moſt delighted and addulced with his daily delicious fare. If any of Zeno or Jovinian his partiſans will not beleeve, that one bodily member is better then an other, I could wiſh it might be beaten into them, and that they might endure ſound raps or blows on their heads, which any other man, yea naturall fools, by naturall inſtinct would rather beare off upon the arms, as objecting unto danger the member of leſſe worth, to ſave and defend the part more principall; which hourely experience ratifieth. I paſſe by all other his objections, becauſe I have ſtood too long on this, and I come to the main Queſtion, *Whether all ſinnes are equall*. The anſwer is plainly negative. Reaſons are theſe. Firſt, diverſitie of ſacrifices prove the inequalitie of offences, the greater offence being uſually expiated with the moſt coſtly ſacrifice. The ſinne of the Prieſt was, in the eſtimate of God, as the ſinne of the whole congregation, and the offering of his ſinne was *a young bullock without blemiſh*, Levit.4.3. If a Magiſtrate ſinned, he was to offer *a kid of the goats, a male without blemiſh*, verſ.23. If an ordinarie man offended, *a female* ſerved the turn, verſ.28. and 32. whether it were of goats or lambes. Where the beſt, greateſt, and coſtlieſt of oblations doth not prove, that the eſtate, or the perſon of the Prieſt was better and more noble then the eſtate or perſon of the King, or ſupreme Civill Magiſtrate, (which the Papiſts impertinently would prove from thence) but the Prieſts greater ſacrifice evinceth his ſinne to be greater, by reaſon of his greater knowledge. *For the Prieſts lips ſhould keep knowledge,*

*Omnia membra æqualiter diligimus, nec oculum præponimus digito, nec digitum auriculæ.

and they ſhould ſeek the Law at his mouth, for he is the Meſſenger of the Lord of hoſts, Malachi 2. 7. A ſecond Reaſon may be this: Greater puniſhments, both criminall and capitall, are ordained by the Law, for ſome people more then for others: But this can not be juſtly appointed, unleſſe there be degrees of ſinne: Therefore ſinnes are not equall. Concerning the *Major*, view it evinced in theſe inſtances: *He that ſtealeth a man, ſhall die*; Exod. 21. 16. *If he ſteal an ox, or a ſheep, he ſhall reſtore five oxen for an ox, and foure ſheep for a ſheep*, Exod. 22. 1. He that kills a man unwillingly, ſhall be protected, Exod. 21. 13. if willingly, the very Sanctuarie, at the horns of the Altar, ſhall not ſave him, he ſhall die, verſ. 14. The adulterie of common people was puniſhed with common death, Levit. 20. 10. But *the daughter of any Prieſt, if ſhe profane her ſelf by playing the whore, ſhe profaneth her father: ſhe ſhall be burnt with fire*, Levit. 21. 9. that is, ſhe ſhall be burnt alive. The *Minor* is proved, becauſe God is juſt, *and rewardeth every man according to his works*, Revel. 22. 12. Thirdly, the Scripture ſaith ſome are more wicked then others, Jerem. 3. 11. *The back-ſliding Iſrael hath juſtified her ſelf more then treacherous Judah. Aholibah was more corrupt in her inordinate love then Aholah*, Ezek. 23. 11. And ſome ſhal have *ſorer puniſhment* then others Heb. 10. 29. There is a ſin remiſſible, & a ſin irremiſſible, Matth. 12. 31. Tyre and Sidon were more inclining to repentance, then Chorazin and Bethſaida, Matth. 11. 21. Accordingly, *It ſhall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom, then for them*, verſ. 24. There are ſome ſinnes of infirmitie, ſome *of preſumption, and great tranſgreſſions*, Pſal. 19. 13. *Reward Babylon even as ſhe rewarded you, and double unto her double, according to her works: in the cup which ſhe hath filled, fill to her double. How much ſhe hath glorified her ſelf, and lived deliciouſly, ſo much torment and ſorrow give her*, Revel. 18. 6, 7. Not, *double aſmuch as ſhe hath deſerved*, that were injuſtice, but, *double aſmuch as others drink of the wrath of God. The proſelyte of the Phariſees is twofold more the childe of hell then themſelves*, Matth. 23. 15. and ſome *ſhall receive greater damnation*, verſ. 14. Geneſ. 4. 15. *Vengeance ſhall be taken ſeven-fold on him who ſlayeth Cain*: Not ſeven-fold more then ſuch a deed as murder deſerveth, but ſeven-fold more then is taken on ſome other men; perchance, ſeven-fold more then was taken on Cain himſelf. For though it be a greater ſinne to kill an innocent, then a bloud-guilty wretch or murderer; and more offenſive to ſlay a brother then one of leſſe kindred, or acquaintance, (which may ſeem to be the caſe between Cain and Abel on the one ſide, and Cain and his murderer on the other ſide) yet if we conſider, that God after an eſpeciall manner forbad any man to kill Cain, that God ordained life as a puniſhment to Cain, that *to kill Cain had been a courteſie*, ſaith Hierom, that Cain was to live to be a terrifying

example

example to all murderers. Lastly, if we remember, that to deterre all men from the murder of Cain, God set a notorious mark upon him, such a one as never any untill this day had the like, by reason of the extraordinarines thereof; whether it were a brand or stamp in his forehead, or that the earth quaked under him whersoever he went, or a preternaturall and unusuall shaking of his head, or dreadfull tremors, or convulsions over all his body, of which the particular is as uncertain, as the generall can not be doubted of, namely, that unto his terrors of conscience, and a vagrant unsetled minde, some outward evident mark was annexed, distinguishing him from other men, and in a sort forbidding any to murder him: I say, he that now should have killed Cain, might justly seven-fold deserve Cains punishment, and an other may rightfully incurre punishment seventy times seven-fold, as it is, if not in truth, yet at the least in the swasive of Lamech to his wives, Genes. 4. 24. There is *a mote*, and there is *a beam*, Matth. 7. 3. This beam may be sawed into many boards or rafters; and there is no vertue nor vice but hath its latitude and degrees partaking of *majus* and *minus*. There are *funiculi vanitatis*, Esai. 5. 18. *cords of vanity*. There are *funes peccatorum*, *ropes of sinnes*, Proverb. 5. 22. And there are *funes plaustri*, as Vatablus rendereth it, according to the Hebrew, *cart-ropes* or *vinculum plaustri*, according to the Vulgar, *the wain-rope*, Esai 5. 18. differencing sinnes, and being indebted to divers kindes of punishments. Every sinne causeth a blot on the soul: the greater sinne, the greater blot. A frequent sinner is compared to *a spotted leopard*, Jerem. 13. 23. and some notorious sinners are called *spots* in the abstract, Jude, vers. 12. More testimonies I could heap, but the point is cleared, and the enquiry, *Wheter Adam or Eve sinned most*, is yet unanswered.

6. And here both ancient and modern Divines do much varie. * Chrysostom saith expresly, *Eve sinned more then Adam:* and * elsewhere to this effect, *Eve was more punished then Adam: but the punishment is answerable to the fault.* Therefore her sinne was greater. Rupert followeth him, * *The woman is punished by a threefold punishment, because her sinne was three times greater then Adams.* Hugo and Lombard, untruly supposing, that Eve onely beleeved the Serpents words promising them *to be like unto God*, do rather think Eve sinned most. The Shoolmen by troups follow them. Cajetan is dubious: commenting on Aquinas he would not differ from his Master, the great Summist, but condemneth the woman more then the man; yet expounding the third of Genesis, he brings five reasons to excuse Eve more then Adam. S. Aug. is by both sides, sometimes ascribing more fault to the man then to the woman, sometimes to the woman rather then to the man: and * twice he seemeth to hold, *That they sinned equally.* On the other side,

* Chryst. Hom. 7. ad Pop. Ant.
* In Rom. Homil. 25. in Morali.
* *Triplici pœnâ mulier punitur, quia triplo majus peccatum fuit ejus quàm Adami.* Rup. in Gen. lib. 3. cap. 22.
* De Gen. ad lit. 11. 35. & De Civit. 14 11.

*Ambr. De Iustit. viri. cap. 4.

*Eve magis mobilitate animi, quàm pravitate peccavit. Comment. in Luc. 4. 38.

*Gravius est de industria peccare, quo modo peccavit Adam, quàm ignorantiâ, quo modo peccavit Eva. Isid. De Summo Bono 2. 17.

*Quantum ad genus peccati, utriusq; peccatum æquale dicitur.

*Ambrose saith, *Adams sinne was greater.* And again, * *Eve sinned more by unstablenes of minde then by perverseness.* Isidore saith, * *It is more honour to sinne of set purpose, as Adam; then out of ignorance, as Eve.* This point needing to be distinguished upon, Aquine telleth us, *The greatnes of a sinne is two wayes considered; either ex ipsa specie peccati, from the especiall kinde of the sinne, or according to the circumstances of place or person: and he resolveth thus;* * *In regard of the kinde of sinne, the sinne of them both is said to be equall. Pride was in both: but if we look ad speciem superbia, Eve sinned more, for these three regards; She was more proud then the man: She not onely sinned herself, but made her husband sinne: Thirdly, Adams sinne was lessened by the love he bore unto his wife. Which last reason is grounded on the words of S. Augustine,* * *Adam sinned not being overcome by carnall concupiscence, but being constrained by some friendly affection; by which it cometh often to passe that God is offended, lest a friend should be offended.* Yea the same S. Augustine is cited thus, * *After the seduced woman had eaten, and had given him that they should eat together, he was loth to grieve her whom he thought ready to pine away without his comfort, and altogether to die being estranged from him.* Lastly, Aquine saith, *If we weigh the condition of both persons, the mans sinne was greater, because he was perfecter then the woman.* So Aquine 2. 2. Quæst. 163. Art. 4.

* *Adam non carnali concupiscentiâ victus, sed amicabili quâdam compulsus benevolentiâ, quâ plerumq; fit ut offendatur Deus, ne offendatur amicus, peccavit.* De Gen. ad lit. 12. ult.

*Postquam mulier seducta manducavit, eiq; dedit ut simul ederent, noluit eam contristari, quam credebat sine suo solatio cortabescere, & à se alienatam omnino interire.

7. Scotus thus opineth, *Because Adam was more circumspect, more noble, more strong to resist; therefore by accident his sinne was more great:* * *Yet formally, in it self, and precisely, the sinne of Eve was greater.* But the learned Estius, on the same distinction, Paragraphe 7, thus, *The greatnes of sinne cometh many wayes; principally from the object and the end, then from the circumstances either of the person or the intent of him, or of the frequencie of the act, or the greatnes of harm that cometh by the sinne, or of the ignorance or infirmitie or industrie of the person. If we lay Adams and Eves sinne in the ballance, respecting the object and the end, it weighed alike; both of them beleeved the Serpent, both would be like God, both ate of the fruit forbidden, both excused their faults: but weigh the circumstances* (saith he) *the mans sinne was simply greater. First, he had more power to resist. Secondly, he dealt with a lesse subtile enemy, a simple woman; but she had to do with an evill Angel, of an higher nature then herself. Thirdly, he had the precept from God himself; she but from her husband. Fourthly, he was to be head over his wife, and not she over him; and he was to reduce her into the right way, when she strayed. Fifthly, his excuse cast part of the fault, as it were, upon God himself. Sixthly, indeed he was worse punished, and so saith Augustine truly. Seventhly, the better things are the worst in their corruption: The best wine turnes to the sharpest vineger, the best of government, a Monarchie, proves the worst, if it degenerate*

*Formaliter tamen, per se merè, & præcisè in se, peccatum Evæ fuit gravius. Scotus in 2. Sent. dist. 27. quæst. 2.

nerate into a Tyranny. But the man exceeded the woman as well in naturals as in gratuitons. So farre in effect Estius.

Bellarmine compareth their acts and persons together, and concludeth, that both in regard of acts and persons, Eve sinned least, Adam worst. His observations are not onely passable, but commendable, save in two things. First, that he makes the excusation of their sinne, to be one act of the seven in Adam and Eves sinne; when as in truth, their excuse was no part or branch of their first sinne, but a distinct and severall sinne by it self. For having ended their first sinne, they were ashamed, and had time to gather figleaves and sew them, and make themselves aprons, or things to gird about them: after this, they heard God speak, and hid themselves: after this, was their examination *de facto*, and their confession: after all this, begins Adams excuse, Genes. 3. 12. and Eves, vers. 13. The diversitie of these severall actions, and the distance of time interceding, shew it was no part of their first sinne to excuse themselves. An other especiall sinne it was, aggravating the former: and in this sinne Adam sinned worst, as accusing God, indirectly, for giving such an helper to him as had hurt him. Who will see things more at large, let him consult with Estius and Bellarmine, unto whom, for the main, I do subscribe; though I make the last part, and act of Adam and Eves sinne, to be their reall orall manducation. The second scape of Bellarmine is, that whereas in true Divinitie, the fall of mankinde is a consequent of our first parents transgression; Bellarmine makes it one of the seven acts of their sinne, confounding the cause with the effect, and not sufficiently distinguishing the fault from the punishment. May I adde these things: Out of the words of Scotus, I thus argue, Originall justice was given to Adam, as to the worthier, abler, and wiser person; yea, it was so given, that if he lost it, he was to lose it for himself and his whole posteritie. But it was not so given, or infeoffeed to Eve; therefore since he failed, when the trust of the whole World was reposed on him, his sinne must needs be much more hainous then hers. If the first sinning Angel was the greatest delinquent, though none of the other Angels sinned in him, but each of himself, by his own proper will; then Adam certainly sinned worse, who bare our persons, and being the Referre, to whom our blessednesse or cursednesse was intrusted, drew us all into unhappinesse. For *the woman was but the incompleat principle of offending*, saith Gorran: But *by Adams first sinne we lost* **the good of nature, which was to be transmitted by the spring of nature*, saith Aquine. By Adams other transgressions the good of personall grace was diminished, and might be recovered, but the Naturall good traducible could not be regained by any repentance. The greatnesse of Adams sinne appeared in that he might so easily have kept the precept;

Bell. De Amis. Gratiæ & Statu Peccati 3.9.

* Bonum naturæ, quod erat per originem naturæ traducendum. Aquin. in Rom. 5. Lect. 3.

*Quanta erat iniquitas in peccando, ubi tanta erat non peccandi facilitas [Aug. De Civit. 14. 15.

*How great iniquitie was there in ſinning, where ſuch facilitie was of not ſinning! ſaith Auguſtine. Indeed to eat of the apple ſeemeth a ſmall matter to the carnall eyes of men, but in the leaſt thing to be diſobedient is not the leaſt offence; for as *to obey is better then ſacrifice*, ſo *diſobedience is as the ſinne of witchcraft, and tranſgreſſion is wickedneſſe and idolatrie*, 1 Sam. 15. 22, 23. Naaman, who would have performed a greater matter, ſhould much more willingly have been ruled by the Prophet in a triſle: it was the well-poiſed argument of his ſervants, 2. Kings 5. 13. and his correſpondent obedience was juſtly rewarded with health. But Adam, beſides the ſmallnes of the matter it ſelf, erred groſly in the manner: for God did not appoint him any hard work, no laborious task to perform. Omiſſion is of an eaſie and pliable nature: more facile it is for one not to waſh a thouſand times, then to waſh once. Now, the precept unto Adam was inhibitive, meerly of omiſſion, negation, or preterition, eaſier to be kept then broken; and therefore to break it was a ſinne of an high hand, a preſumptuous ſinne, which may be aggravated in him by this circumſtance, that he received the reſtraint from God, which Eve did not. They who think otherwiſe of Adams ſinne, do judge of it as the common people do of the fixed ſtarres, who imagine them to be no greater then a candle. But if you truly take the height and breadth of Adams ſinne, it will be found, as the ſtarres in heaven, of greatnes almoſt incredible; divers of them, in their ſeverall ſtations, being greater then the whole earth. Perhaps one of the reaſons, why the Apoſtle, Heb. 11. nameth not Adam among the old faithfull Heroes, was this, becauſe he committed a greater ſinne then any of them. For his offence hath been the cauſe of death, of ſickneſs, of all puniſhments inflicted on men, in this life or in the life to come. Not Satans temptation, not Eves ſeduction, but Adams wilfull diſobedience coſt the bloud of the Sonne of God. And all the deſpighteous ſinnes of mankinde, wherewith the Father bleſſed for ever, the gracious Redeemer, and the ſanctifying Spirit are grieved, and do as it were grone under, and at which the holy Angels are offended, and do in their ſort mourn, proceed originally from that ſinne of Adam, and but for that had never been. Therefore was his offence greater then Eves. Moreover, God firſt ſummoned Adam, though Eve ſinned firſt, and queſtioned Adam particularly for that ſin, and not Eve, Geneſ. 3. 9. and at the cenſure (perchance with an emphaſis) God ſaid unto Adam (which he did not unto Eve) Gen. 3. 17. *Thou haſt eaten of the tree of which I commanded THEE, ſaying, THOU ſhalt not eat of it*; and denounced more puniſhments againſt him then againſt Eve, and worſe; and this among the reſt, ratifying the former threatning, *Duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return*; inflicting death on Adam, on Eve, on us for

for Adams sinne, and not for Eves. Lastly, the Spirit of God seemeth to derive the fault from Eve unto the Serpent, 2 Cor. 11.3. ἐξηπάτησεν Εὔαν ὁ ὄφις ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, *in astutia sua*: *deceived Eve, in his craft*, and her simplicitie, *he deceived her*. Now let Scotus lessen Adams offence as much as he can; let him say, * *The eating of the forbidden tree was no sinne, but because it was forbidden; and he might well and lawfully have eaten of it, if he had not been forbidden; and he erred not against any naturall law, but a law positive, and in a thing otherwise indifferent.* I answer, The same and more excuses are for Eve. Again, in regard of its spreading infection, and the myriads of evils thence ensuing, & the blessed estate of many millions by him betrayed to the lake of fire and brimstone, which never shall be quenched, contrarie to the trust to him concredited, I shall alwayes think Adams sinne the worst of all sinnes that ever any one of mankinde committed, not excepting the sinne of Judas, or the sinne against the Holy Ghost. For these hurt but few; and if they were worse intensively, they were not so bad extensively: and therefore I must account it one of Scotus his errours, when he saith, * *The greatest punishment was not due to Adams sinne; yea, if he had been damned himself for that sinne, he had not been so grievously punished for it as many others.* The ancient Fathers did not so lightly prize the first sinne of Adam. Augustine saith, * *A Precept so light for keeping, so short for remembring, was broken by so much greater injustice, by how much more easily it might have been kept.* And though Scotus holdeth, it did consist in immoderate love and friendship to his wife; yet I say, his uxoriousnesse was but a branch, a piece, a quarter, a rafter of that beam, a part, a member of that body of sinne. * Tertull. doubts not to call Adams sinne, *Heresie*, and Adam, *a very rude Heretick*. Ambrose on Rom. 5.14. * *Adams sinne is not farre from idolatrie.* And in his 33. Epistle to his sister Marcellina, he findes *infidelitie* in Adam, for not beleeving in Gods word. Augustine in his Enchirid. chap. 45. imputes unto him *Pride*, & *Sacriledge*; for it was sacrilegious pride, to impropriate & usurp the fruit separated from common use. He was a murderer, destroying himself & all mankinde: guiltie he was of spirituall fornication committed with the Serpent. He may be further charged for felony, in stealing the fruit which was not his. Rupertus on Genes. 2. 39. saith, *Ingratitude was his first sinne. He fell by covetousnes*, saith Augustine, *for God could not suffice him; and having much more then he needed, yet he would need more then he had.* Any one may blot him with curiositie, for seeking to know what did him hurt. His gluttony was manifest, in loosing the reins to his beastly appetite. His want of naturall affection toward his posteritie by him decaying, is justly blameable. Brentius hath one new-fangle on John 8, *That Adams sinne was rebellion or defection, because*

* *Esus ligni vetiti non fuit peccatum, visi quia prohibitum.*

* *Peccato Adæ non debebatur maxima pœna; imò si ipse damnatus fuisset pro illo peccato, non fuisset ità graviter punitus pro illo peccato, sicut multi alii.*

* *Tam leve præceptum ad observandum, tam breve ad memoriâ retinendum, tantò majore injustitiâ violatum est, quantò faciliori posset observantiâ custodiri.* De Civit. 14. 12.

* Tert. Cont. Marcion. lib. 2.

* *Peccatum Adæ non longè est ab idololatria.*

cause he would not be subject to Christ. He might rather have accused him for contempt of his Creator, for his folly in venturing the losse of heaven for an apple, for his credulity in beleeving Satan before God. The Apostle chargeth him with *disobedience*, Rom. 5. 19. Bellarmine saith, * *The first act of pride is to refuse to be subject to the command and precepts of another, which properly is called disobedience: as contrarily, the first of humility is to be subject to another.* But Scotus doth better set down the order of the acts of our will: * *There is commonly a double act of the will,* LIKING *and* DISLIKING; *—and every disliking presupposeth some liking: —— and no disliking is the first inordinate act of the will, because it could not have a disliking, but in regard or by vertue of some liking.* In this I preferre Scotus before Bellarmine and Estius, because the first act of pride or disobedience is self-complacencie, from whence issueth the dislike, or *nolle* of subjection, as in humilitie, the first act is *Velle placere alteri*, whence ariseth the groundwork of obedience. Secondly, Augustine saith, * *They began in secret to be evil: the ill will preceded the ill work, self-love was the bait, the Devil could not have caught Adam,* * *unles he had begun already to be self pleased: they were tickled with those words,* YE SHALL BE LIKE GODS, Gen. 3. 5. From whence I marvel Bellarmine observed not, that *Velle sibi placere* is the first step of pride, and therefore the *Nolle subjici* is the second act, or act concomitant. Thirdly, * Bellarmine himself interfeering saith, *The pride of our parents began not from this act,* I WILL NOT BE UNDER THE POWER OF GOD, *but after the hearing of these words,* YE SHALL BE LIKE GODS, *they began to consider within themselves, it was a goodly thing not to depend of an other; and at the same time they began to be delighted with their own power, and to desire it, and vehemently to please themselves.* Here he maketh three or foure acts to beginne together, and maketh some ill act or acts precede this, *I will not be under the power of God.* Lastly, * Bellarmine hath it thus, * *The first ill act in the sinne of the man was pride, by which he loved to be in his own power rather then in Gods.* And he citeth Augustine in Enchirid. chap. 45. Therefore the beginning of Adams iniquitie consisted in a VELLE, rather then in a NOLLE. Now, though Scotus his Discourse and Philosophie sideth thus farre with truth, that an evil *Nolle* necessarily presupposeth an evil *Velle*, (which is expressely against the opinion of Bellarmine and Estius) yet it crawleth on lamely towards * Scotus his conclusion, *That Adam did first sinne in inordinate love of friendship towards his wife* for I will place in Adam another *Velle*, a former *Velle*, a *malum Velle*, and a *pejus Velle* before his uxoriousnesse. Augustine in his 21 Sermon upon Psal. 118. (which we account the 119 Psal.) saith thus, * *That man would be his own, that is the first and greatest evil of disobedience.* And * elsewhere he takes pride and disobedience

*Actus primus superbiæ est, velle subjici imperio & præceptis alterius, quæ propriè dicitur inobedientia. Bell. De Amiss. Gratiæ 3. 4.

* Est in communi duplex actus voluntatis, VELLE & NOLLE —— & omne nolle præsupponit aliquod velle —— & nullum nolle est primus actus deordinatus voluntatis, quia non posset habere nolle, nisi respectu, vel in virtute alicujus velle. Scot. in 2. Sent. dist. 6. quæst. 2.

*In occulto mali esse cæperunt. Aug. De Civit. 14. 13.

* Nisi jam ille sibi placere cæpisset.

* Bellarm. ibi cap. 5.

* Bell. De Amiss. Gratiæ 3. 9.

*Primus actus malus in peccato viri superbia fuit, quâ in sua potiùs esse, quàm in Dei potestate dilexit.

* Scot. Dist. 22.

*Quòd homo suus esse voluit, id est inobedientiæ primum & maximum malum.

*De Civit. 14. 13. & de Gen. ad lit. 8. 14.

bedience for all one. Again, * *Man being lift up with pride, obeying the perſuaſion of the Serpent deſpiſed Gods precepts.* And, * *In the will of man there goes before ſome deſire of his own power, to be made diſobedient through pride.* Eves pride, out of doubt, aroſe from thoſe words, Geneſ. 3. 5. *Your eyes ſhall be opened, and ye ſhall be as Gods.* Where the hint was given to the *Velle*, before the *Nolle*; and the firſt motion was to the unlawfull love of himſelf. Now, what the Serpent ſaid to Eve, queſtionleſſe ſhe related to Adam. And her pride alſo might firſt ariſe from the ſaid fountain: and his uxorioufneſſe followed thereupon; and the immoderate love of himſelf was before the immoderate love unto his wife. I ſay *queſtionles*, becauſe it is both true in it ſelf, and others yeeld unto it, and * S. Auguſtine obſerveth it, *What Adam received from God, he told to Eve; what Eve heard from Satan, ſhe told to Adam.* To conclude, * Auguſtine ſaith, *Adam and Eve were firſt turned from God to pleaſe themſelves, and thence and after that to grow cold and dull; that ſhe either beleeved the Serpent, or he preferd his wives will before the will of God.* Where he maketh both Adams and Eves ſinne to be the ſame inordinate love to themſelves; and this is againſt Scotus. Proſper in the 358 Sentence, picked out of Auguſtine, ſaith, concerning Adam, * *The firſt vice of the reaſonable ſoul is the will of doing thoſe things which the ſupreme and moſt intimate truth forbids.* Neither hath Scotus his argutation, rather then argumentation, his uſuall ſubtiltie in it. * *There is a twofold will: either that will by which one deſires a thing with the love of friendſhip, which is for himſelf or for the thing loved; or that will by which one deſires a thing with the love of profit, which is for another. The firſt ſinne of Adam was not out of an immoderate love of himſelf, as the firſt ſinne of Angels, neither could be; becauſe the Angels know themſelves firſt, by their own eſſence; but man knowes other things before himſelf.* For did not Adam know himſelf ere he knew Eve or Angels? or hath it any neceſſarie conſequence, if he knew her firſt, that therefore he muſt love her content firſt, rather then pleaſe himſelf? Yea, if he had a deſire to pleaſe her, might not this ariſe out of a deſire to pleaſe himſelf? Laſtly, did the Angels and Eve ſinne out of an immoderate deſire of love toward themſelves? Then how ſaith Scotus, that Adams firſt ſinne neither was, nor could be an immoderate and inordinate love of himſelf? What was in Eve, could and might have been and was in Adam. The diſcourſe of Aquinas in this point ſeemes more agreeable to Scripture, and Fathers, then that of Scotus. And this it is. That unto one ſinne many motions do concurre, amongſt which that is to be accounted the firſt ſinne, in which firſt of all, inordination, deviation, diſorder, or aberration from the Law is found. Now it is apparent, that exorbitancy or deordination is ſooner in the inward motion of the ſoul, then it is in the bodie; and among the

* *Homo elatus ſuperbiâ, ſuaſioni Serpentis obediens præcepta Dei contempſit.* Epiſt. Ad Oroſium.

* *Præcedit in voluntate hominis appetitus quidam propriæ poteſtatis, vt fiat inobediens per ſuperbiam.* De peccat. Merit. & Rem. 2. 19.

* Aug. De Gen. ad lit. 11. 34.

* De Civit. 14. 13.

* *Primum animæ rationalis vitium eſt, voluntas ea faciendi quæ vetat ſumma & intima veritas.*

* *Duplex eſt Velle: aut eſt Velle aliquid amore amicitiæ, qui eſt propter ſe, vel propter amatum; vel amore commodi, qui eſt propter aliud. Primum peccatum Adæ non fuit ex immoderato amore ſui, ſicut fuit primum peccatum Angeli, nec potuit eſſe; quia Angelus intelligit ſe primò, per ſuam eſſentiam; & homo intelligit alia priùs quàm ſe.*

the interiour motions of the ſoul, the appetite is firſt moved toward the end it ſelf, then toward the means leading toward the end: and therefore there was the firſt ſinne of Adam, where was the firſt deſire of an unlawfull and diſordered end. The ſumme is; Man deſired an illicit ſeeming ſpirituall good; namely, to ſubſiſt of himſelf, as God doth. Which firſt act or motion of pride, or inward diſobedience, being all one with the firſt inclination to break the Law of God and to eat the forbidden fruit, and being accompanied with that chain of other evill motions & actions before mentioned, was conſummated by the outward diſobedience in the orall eating the food inhibited. And the time was ſo ſhort between the ſinfull *motus primo-primus* in the ſoul, and the various continued difformitie of other ebullitions, which were coherent and bound up in that unhappie knot of outward diſobedience, that we may ſafely ſay, it was one ſinne *aggregativè*; and every particular evill thought, act, or motion, from his fare-well given unto innocency, unto his plain down-fall, from the laſt of his inward obedience, unto his firſt outward diſobedience, compleat and ended, was a parcell or branch of that one great ſinne which was againſt that Law divine, Geneſ.2.17. As our Saviour ſaith, Matth.5.28. *Whoſoever looketh on a woman to luſt after her, hath committed adulterie with her already in his heart:* So, ſo ſoon as ever Adam looked on the apple to luſt after it, the firſt inward motion, tending to this luſt of pride or diſobedience, was averſe from the Law, though the externall treſpaſſe made the ſinne to be full, and the breach to be palpable and evident. And as it is but one conſummate adulterie, though divers evil thoughts, *& multæ moroſæ cogitationes, many wilde motions* concurre unto it: ſo may Adams ſinne be ſaid to be but one, though conſiſting of divers parts and branches, from the primative ſpirituall inclination of averſion, to the hindmoſt bodily formalitie, or cõſummation of his diſobedience. *Eſtius hath theſe arguments, to evidence that pride (which is unſeparably annexed to diſobedience) was the firſt ſinne of man. Firſt, our parents, Adam and Eve, were firſt tempted with the ſinne of pride, by theſe words, *Ye ſhall be like Gods*; therefore by that they fell firſt. Secondly, the Devil would draw man to perdition, by the ſame ſinne by which he fell: But he fell by pride, 1 Tim.3.6. Laſtly, Chriſt by humilitie and obedience recovered us; therefore Adam by pride and diſobedience hurt us. And this is Auguſtines reaſon, *De Civit.*14.13. If any man deſire more curioſities trenching upon this point, let him conſult with Doctor Eſtius, in the place above cited, who hath handled ſuch things *apertiſſimè & ſatiatiſſimè, moſt plainly and fully*, as Auguſtine ſaid of Ambroſe, againſt Julian the Pelagian.

Eſt. Diſt. 22 Paragr. 1.

And now at length I am come to that ſecond poſition which I re-

I resolved to unfold and handle, in giving answer unto the first Question; *How and why death was appointed unto us.* The first part of the answer is already handled, (& here I considered originall sinne principally; as it was acted by Adam) *That Adam for sinne was appointed to die.* The second now followeth, towit, *Adams sinne was propagated to us*; and so by just consequent, *We shall die for his sinne.* And first, concerning the propagation of his sinne, of originall sinne, as it was an emanation from Adam, and as it lodgeth and abideth in us.

ALmightie, and most Gracious Father, grant unto us, that we which fell by pride, may by humilitie and obedience be raised up, through Jesus Christ, our onely Advocate and Redeemer. Amen.

CHAP. V.

1. *Originall sinne, is an obscure point. The errors of the Schoolmen concerning it. The oversight of Bellarmine.*
2. *Originall sinne described by its causes: Distinguished from Adams actuall sinne.*
3. *In what sense Adam had, and his posteritie hath originall sinne. We were in Adam. He stood for us idealiter. Every one of us would have done exactly as Adam did. We did sinne in Adam, and how.*
4. *Whether Christ was in Adam, and how.*
5. *We sinned not that sinne in Adam by imitation.*
6. *Adams sinne, as personall, was not imputed. Adam is saved. Adams actuall sinne, as it was ideall and representative, is imputed to us.*

I Concerning originall sinne, though it be most true, what S. Augustine saith, de Morib. Eccl. 22. *All here is nothing to preach of more knowne, nothing to understand more hidden then originall sinne.* And, *We ought to seek nothing beyond the root.* Yet let us search, till we finde this root. And since

Nihil est peccato originali ad prædicandum notius, nihil ad intelligendum secretius.
Ultra radicem nihil quærere oportet. De lib. Arbitrio 3. 17.

the Apostle hath broken the ground, and opened the way, let us joyfully follow so blessed a guide. S. Paul, Rom. 5. 12. ... hath a large Tractate of originall sinne, as it is propagated unto us by Adam: and Rom. 6. he speaketh of it, as it is in the Regenerate. The present questioned point hath nothing to do with this latter consideration, and it is pertinently excluded from this discourse. But of originall sinne, as it is conveyed unto us by Adam, divers things must be explained. First, you are to know, that the Schoolmen are blindly led in this point. You may see it at large *in Beatissimo* Whitakero*, (for even that title is given to him by the learned Albericus Gentilis, in the tenth Chapter of his Disputation on the first Book of the Maccabees.) And certainly, none of late time hath so tripped them up as he hath done, in his canvasse of Stapleton. The errors of singular Schoolmen are various, too many to be here confuted severally, yet not so many as are imagined. Holcot in his Question, *Whether every sin be imputable to the will*, proveth out of Augustines Book *De Hæresibus*, Chap. 8. that some Hereticks have denied originall sinne, or that there is any such thing. But he resolveth, *That the Church hath determined the opinion to be erroneous.* And Augustine, Gregorie, Bede, and all Authentick Doctors have spoken fully and expresly hereof. *And I (saith he) suppose it as one Article of Faith.* Then cometh he to the diversitie of opinions, *Some*, saith he, *have held, that originall sinne is not culpa, but pœna, or obligatio ad pœnam. Anselm and Lombard dislike this*, saith he. And indeed Lombard proveth soundly, both that according to this opinion originall sinne is neither *culpa*, no, nor *pœna*, and by excellent arguments establisheth, that it is *culpa*. *Some* (saith Holcot) *who say it is culpa, hold it is nothing els but the actuall sinne of our first parent imputed to us: and this Tenet Anselm disliketh.* But Anselms dislike hath not hindered Catharinus and Pighius from embracing that error. Yea Stapleton himself acknowledgeth three great errors in this bypath of Pighius. First, That he makes originall sinne no sinne, but an obnoxietie to punishment. Secondly, That children want all sinne, and yet are by him made sinners. Thirdly, That he makes no inherent originall sinne in every one. Whitaker addeth a fourth absurdity, That he teacheth children are damned, who yet have no sinne. I return to Holcot, who adeth, *or else I say, Originall sinne is the pure privation of justice originall, for injustice which is nothing in nature, but a pure privation and want of justice, in subjecto apto nato.* Yet, saith Holcot, (as I have said elsewhere) it appeareth not to us, *that any such pure privation (either originall or actuall sinne.* At last, Holcot professeth to follow Lombard, holding, that originall sinne is an evil habit with which we are born, and which we contract from the beginning of our nativitie. This habit is concupiscence, this concupiscence

*Whitak. De Originali Peccato lib. 1. cap. 3.

*Lomb. 2. Sent. dist. 30. lit. E & F.

is a vice, *quod parvulum habilem concupiscere facit, adultum verò concupiscentem reddit*, and this he fathereth on Augustine. But this opinion is no better then the rest, if by concupiscence they mean (as they do) onely the sensuality, lust, and brutish appetite of things sensitive. You shall see it further confuted, when I have disclosed the erronious doctrine, which Lombard and his partisans hold, to uphold this, *That originall sinne is the vice of concupiscence.* * Lombard maintaineth that every one of our bodies were in Adam: and whereas it was before objected, That all flesh which descended from Adam, could not be at once and together in him, because it is farre greater then the body of Adam, in which there were not so many, as it were, motes of flesh, as men, who have descended from him; Lombard answereth, *All flesh was in him materially and causally, though not formally: and all that is in humane bodies naturally, descendeth from Adam, and in it self is increased and multiplied, and this is that which shall arise at the Resurrection: That no outward substance doth passe into that substance: That it is fomented by meats, but no meats are turned into that substance humane, which by propagation descended from Adam. For Adam transmitted a little of his substance into the bodies of his children, when he begat them, that is, a little MODICUM was divided from the masse of his substance, and thereof was the body of his sonne formed, and by multiplication of it self is increased, without the adjection of any outward thing. And of that Modicum being augmented, somewhat is separated, whereby the bodies of posterities are in the like sort still formed.* His proofs were easie to be answered: but there is a *vera*, or an *obelisk* set on that opinion, in the margin, *Magister hic non approbatur.* And more at large, among the errors condemned in England and in Paris (for so go the words of the Preface) not in England and France, not alone in Oxford and Paris, but in both the Universities of England, and in that of Paris, you shall finde him forsaken in these opinions, pag. 985. 1 *That no externall thing passeth into the truth of humane nature.* 2 *That which descendeth from Adam, and is increased and multiplied by propagation, shall arise in the day of judgement.* These singular opinions being now rejected and confuted by Estius, Sentent. 2. Distinct. 30. Paragraph. 13. and whatsoever Lombard bringeth for himself, answered in his next Paragraph; let us grapple with Holcot, who is a second unto Lombard, and let us prove, *That originall sinne is not the concupiscence of the flesh.* See this confuted by * Bellarmine, by this argument; *If LUST were the cause of originall sinne, he should have the greater sinne, who was conceived in greater LUST: which is manifestly false, since originall sinne is equall in all men.* See other arguments well used to that purpose by Bellarmine in that place; yet is he amisse *elsewhere, in the answer unto the tenth argument of the Anabaptists. For, saith he, *Originall*

* Lomb. 2. Sent. dist. 30. lit. N.

1. *Quod in veritatem humanæ naturæ nihil transit extrinsecum.* 2. *Quod ab Adam descendit, per propagationem auctum & multiplicatum, resurget in judicio.* pag. 985.

* Bell. De Amiss. Gratiæ 4. 12.

* *De Sacramento Baptismi* 1. 9.

Originale peccatum non est materia pœnitentiæ: nemo enim recte pœnitentiam agit ejus peccati quod ipse non commisit, & quod in ejus potestate non fuit. Originale autem peccatum non ipsi commisimus, sed trahimus ab Adam per naturalem propagationem: unde dicitur de infantibus, Rom. 9. 11.

sinne is no matter of repentance: for a man doth not well repent of that sinne which he hath not committed himself, and which is not in his power. Now we have not our selves committed originall sinne, but we draw it from Adam by naturall propagation: whereupon it is said, Rom. 9. 11. of Esau and Jacob, THEY HAD DONE NEITHER GOOD NOR EVIL. First, I answer to the place of Scripture, confessing it is spoken of Esau, wicked Esau, that he had done no evill, and of Jacob, good Jacob, that he had done no good. Again, it is spoken of both of them, before they were born. But secondly, it is spoken of actuall sinnes and actuall goodnes; that neither did Jacob good, actuall good, any good in the wombe, nor Esau any actuall evil. For the bodily organs are not so fitted, that they exercise such actions as produce good or evil. The words do evince so much, *nihil operatione, id est, reipsa, practically working no good nor evil.* Yet, though God depended not upon their works (as the Apostle there argueth) for all that, they might and did commit originall sinne, and in it were conceived: and the promise was made to Rebecca, after she conceived, Genes. 25. 23. It being then manifest, that the place of the Apostle affordeth no patrociny to Bellarmine, I say originall sinne is in part the matter of Repentance; otherwise, David in his chiefest penitentiall Psalme, 51. 5. would not have charged himself with that sinne, nor needed not so vehemently to call for mercy. Again, we may be said to commit originall sinne, and originall sinne to have been in our power, as we were in Adam, as we would have done the like, and the like against Adam, as Adam did against us, if we had stood in Adams place, as he did stand in our stead. Thirdly, our will was in his will, & what he did we did: Bellarmines Philosophie here swalloweth up his Divinitie. Fourthly, he must not take *committere* strictly, for a full free deliberate action of commission; nor *trahere* strictly, for a meer passion: but (as I shall make it appear) there is some little inclination, from the matter to the form, of the body to the soul, as also of the soul to the body; and that the soul is neither as a block or stone on the one side, to receive dust and be integrally passive, nor yet so active as to make the originall sinne to be actuall. So that it neither properly committeth, nor properly contracteth, draweth, or receiveth originall sinne: and yet in a large sense may be said both to commit and to receive. Fifthly, if Bellarmine be punctilious for the terms, himself is faultie: For he saith, * *We do attract originall sinne from Adam.* Is there any *attraction* on our part, if there be no action? Or is action, or attraction without some kinde of commission? Sixthly, hath the whole Church of God prayed for the remission aswell of originall sinne as of actuall, if it be not the matter of repentance? Or needeth not one unbaptized, till he come of age, repent before Baptisme, for his originall sinne?

* *Trahimus ab Adam originale peccatum.*

Lastly,

Lastly, why are children baptized, but that originall sinne is matter of repentance?

To set all things better in order, and to cleare all mists, you are to know, that there is wonderfull mistaking, and ambiguitie, whil'st originall sinne is confounded with Adams actuall sinne, and one taken for another; whil'st the cause is undistinguished from the effect, when indeed there is a great traverse between them.

2 Somewhat according to the new Masters of method, the efficient cause of Adams sinne was both outward and inward.

Outward { Remote; / Propinque.

Remote { Principall; Satan. / Instrumentall, the Serpent.

Outward propinque was. { Eve, the principall. / The apple was the instrumentall cause.

The inward efficient cause was; first, the faculties of the soul, which we may terme the *principium activum*, and was more remote; then the ill use of these faculties, the misimploying of his free-will, which you may stile *principium actuale*, and was the more propinque cause. But the cause efficient of originall sinne was, outwardly, the actuall sinne of Adam; inwardly, the conjunction of the soul, after the propagation of nature. The matter of Adams sinne, *subjectivè*, was the whole person and nature of Adam, and his posteritie descending from him *per viam seminalem*; *objectivè*, the liking, touching, and eating of the forbidden fruit. The matter of originall sinne, *subjectivè*, is all of our nature, and every one of mankinde, *secundum se totum & totum sui*, coming the ordinarie way of generation: in so much, that all and every of the faculties of the soul and bodie, of all and every one of us, is subject to all and every sinne, which hath been, or may ever hereafter be committed: and this cometh onely from this originall sinne, and the inclination wrapped up in it. The matter *objectivè*, is both *carentia justitiæ originalis debitæ inesse*, and the vices contrarie unto it, now filling up its room and stead. *Formalis ratio of Adams first sinne was aversion from God*, *the ratio materialis was his conversion to a changeable good*, saith * Stapleton: both these are knit up in one disobedience. And so, the formall cause of Adams sinne was disobedience, the formall cause of our originall sinne is the deformitie and corruption of nature, saine and propagated, inclining to sinne so soon as is possible, and (without a divine hand of restraint) as much as is possible. The end of Adams sinne was in his intention, primarily, *To know good and evill*, secundarily, to prefer temporals before spirituals; whil'st indeed he esteemed the *Bonum apparens* before the *Bonum verum revera*, or *reale*. In man-

* Stapl. De Originali Peccato l. 12.

mankinde after him no end can be found of originall sinne, since we contract it when we have *nullum verum objectum, respectum, intuitum, vel finem.* For *Finis dat bonum convertibile.* There is no end of evill, *per se, sed ex accidenti*; and so Gods Glory is the supreme end of all sinne. The effects of Adams actuall sinne were, his *Corruptio personæ, Reatus, & Pœna*, as he was considered by himself, till he repented, but as he was the Referree and Representor of mankinde, the effects were, The corruption of our nature, our fault, our guiltines, our punishment, till we be freed. The effects of our originall sinne are, sinnes actuall, with all the penalties or punishments due to them. Moreover, that we may more distinctly enlarge this point, and remove the doubtfulnesse of termes, know, that in a larger sense, the actuall sinne of Adam may in a sort be said to be originall sinne; it may be called Adams originall sinne, as it was first and originally in him. It may be originall sinne both of Adam and all his posterity; because our naturall defects, and all manner of sinnes flowed originally from this onely sinne, as from a defiled fountain. Yet properly, this sinne was in him actually, in us potentially; in him explicitly, in us implicitly, in him personally, in us naturally; in him *perse*, in us *per accidens*. And that his first sinne or aversion from God, may both be said to be his originall sinne, and the cause also of our originall sinne; the cause, not physicall or naturall (for he doth not traduce, by the vertue of that sinne, any real thing which is properly sinfull, unto his posterity) but it was and is the morall cause of our originall sinne. As originall sinne is by some described, namely, *to be propagated, to be in all alike, and to be in the humane creature at the beginning of his being*, or to be *an hereditaria transgressio*: so Adam had not originall sinne, but onely his posterity. As originall sinne is defined to be *That inobedience or transgression, that totall aversion of mankinde from God, whereby we incurre death and damnation*: so was Adams sinne our originall sinne, and he had originall sinne.

3. Which the fuller to demonstrate, let me insist on this point, namely, *That sinne of Adam we sinned this way, as we were in him materialiter, though not formaliter.* As the severall members of a mans body united to his soul, make one individuall person: so all the branches of Adams posteritie, with himself, make one humane nature, and are as it were but one by participation of the *species*. * *All were in Adam when he sinned: they were indeed in him, but they were not yet born themselves*, saith Augustine, *De Civit.* 13. 14. and more punctually in the same Chapter, * *The form in which every one of us should live, was not yet created and distributed to us; but the seminall nature was already, of which we were to be propagated.* Anselm saith, * *The infant that is damned for originall sinne, is not damned for the sinne of Adam, but for his own:*

* *Fuerunt omnes in Adam quando peccavit; fuerunt quidem in illo, sed nondum nati erant ipsi.*

* *Nondum erat nobis singillatim creata & distributa forma, in qua singuli viveremus; sed jam natura erat nobis seminalis, ex qua propageremur.*

own: for if he himself had not his own sinne, he should not be damned. And therefore Augustine, *Retract.* 2.13. * *Originall sinne in infants, though they have not yet the use of freewill, is not absurdly called voluntary.* And *Confess.* 1.7. *The smalnes of infant members, not the soul of infants is innocent.* Lastly, *De Peccat. Meritis & Remiss.* 3. 8. as he calleth originall sinne oftentimes *Alienum peccatum*, to shew it began not in us alone, but was delivered to us, came from without: so in the same place he termeth it *Peccatum proprium*, our selves sinning in and with Adam, and having corruption in us by him. It can not sink into my head, that God would have imputed unto us Adams fault, by his absolute irrespective decreeory will of good pleasure: but that he whose foresight reacheth to things that are not, yea to things that shall never be, much more to things certainly future (of which in another place) did foreknow and preconsider, that every one of mankinde, if they had been in Adams state and place, would have done as Adam did. Therefore, let us not accuse God, or lay the fault onely on Adam, our selves would have done so. For, as one said concerning the thief on the Crosse, confessing Christ when Christ was on the Crosse nailed, naked, pained, reviled, scorned, dying, and forsaken of his own Disciples, *Profitebo ego non fecissem, I should not have made so glorious a confession as the penitent thief did at that time*: So, on the contrary, I say, and am fully perswaded, *I should have done as Adam did.* Let God be just, and all men faulty; for it would have been the fault of all men. Yea, I must go one step further, and without boldnes justifiably say, by verdict of Scripture, it was the fault of all men; all men did sinne that sinne in Adam. It is not said *Propter hominem*, but, *Per hominem Mors*, 1 Cor. 15.22. and Rom. 5.12. ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον: *In quo*, in whom *all sinned.* Of the first man, Adam, are all these words [*By man, and in whom*] to be understood: and *by him, and in him all died and sinned*, saith the Apostle; and sinned that sinne by which death came into the world. Though the father of the faithfull payed tithes of all unto Melchisedec, before Levi was born, and Abraham alone personally discharged that duty; yet for all this, the Apostle saith, Hebr. 7.9. *Levi also who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham, for he was yet in the loyns of his father*: So on the contrary, though Adam, the universall father of mankinde, did actuate that great offence long before we were created; yet we also concurred in our kinde, and were partakers in that iniquity. For he stood *Idealiter* for us, and we were in him; our will in his, our good and hurt in his; and so farre as he received a law for us, so farre as he represented us; so farre when he sinned did we sinne in him, with him, and by him. And if the worthy S. Augustine may say, as is before cited, * *omnes eramus ille unus Adam*, I hope I may say, as well say, *I was ille unus*

* *Infans qui damnatur pro peccato originali, non damnatur pro peccato Adam, sed pro suo: nam & ipse habuit suum peccatum, non damnatum Aufil. De Parvu Virginis, cap. 24.*

* *Originale peccatum in parvulis, quod aliis non alienum sed sibi ipsis voluntarium, nisi abluerit baptismus, non absolvit.*

* *Inberentibus membris infantium languet adhuc, nec anima infantium.*

* *De Peccat. Merit. & Remiss. l. 10.*

omnes. hath sure, Prosper in his Sentences pickt out of Augustine saith, that * *The first man Adam so died in time past, that yet after him Christ is the second man, although so many thousands of men be born between that and this: and therefore it is evident, that every one who is born propagated from that succession belongs to that former, as whosoever is born again by the liberality of grace pertains to this latter: whence it comes to passe that all mankinde, in some sort, consists in two men,* THE FIRST *and* THE SECOND. Yea, the whole world, except Christ onely, as men, are the first Adam; and the first Adam, as he believed in Christ to come, is not now the first, but a branch of the second Adam. What Christ did for us, we are said to do; what Adam did misdo, as he represented us, we may justly be said to misdo with him, Genes. 4. 10. *The voice of thy brothers blood crieth unto me:* Sanguinum; yea, Seminum, saith the Chaldee Paraphrase, and the Rabbins; whom, howsoever the Jesuit Cornelius à Lapide faulteth, yet I will commend for their witty invention, *That God seemed, as it were, to heare the cries of all those many little ones, which ever might have discended from Abel; and them Cain killed, and their blond he shed even ere they were, and their blond cried in Abels.* So we consented with Adam, and *in him all sinned*, saith our Apostle: ἐφ' ᾧ, our latest Translation hath it *For that all have sinned*, The Bishops Bible *in as much as we have all sinned*: So Erasmus, and some others; yet our latest Translation alloweth a place in the margin for *in whom*: it is rendred by the Vulgat, *In quo.* ἐφ' ᾧ is not here taken for a Preposition, of whose various constructions see the Grammarians; none of which constructions afford so full and punctuall a sense to this place, as if we render the words ἐφ' ᾧ, *in whom*: ἐπὶ being a Preposition by it self, and ᾧ being the Dative of the subjunctive relative article ὅς. The Genevian readeth it *in whom*, and interpretes the words *in whom* to be *in Adam*: and so indeed it may be read and must be meant; for though the Preposition ἐπὶ be otherwise rendred and used, yet divers times it is confounded with ἐν, and necessarily is so to be understood. View in one Chapter two places, Hebr. 9. 10. ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι, *Solummodo in cibis & potibus, Which stood onely in meats and drinks*, as our very late Translatours have it. And vers. 17. ἐπὶ νεκροῖς διαθήκη, *Testamentum enim in mortuis ratum est*: so word for word is it construed. So Demosthenes hath it, ἐπὶ τούτοις εἰρήνην, *In his acquiescere.* Basil in his Epistle to Nazianzen, ἐπὶ τῆς ἐρημίας ταύτης, *In hac solitudine.* So we usually say ἐπ' ἐμοὶ, *In nobis*, and the like. This reading being established, let us search the meaning of these words *In whom* or *in which*, and to what they are referred. There are but foure things, to which these words can possibly have relation. First, unto the word κόσμος; and then the sense is, *By one man sinne entred into the world, in which world all*

have

* *Primus homo Adam sic olim defunctus est, ut tamen post illum secundus homo sit Christus, cumque hominum millia inter illum & hunc orta sint; ideo manifestum est pertinere ad illum, quicunque ex illo successione propagatus nascitur, sicut ad istum pertinet omnis qui ex ista largitate in illo renascitur: unde fit, ut totum genus humanum quodam modo sint homines duo,* PRIMUS & SECUNDUS. Prosp. Sent. 299.

have sinned. This exposition is very absurd. For first, it is nothing to the intent of the Apostle, who proveth that we fell in Adam, and are raised by Christ: but how conduceth this unto that sense? Secondly, the senselesnesse of the words is most ridiculous, being thus read, *As by one man sinne entred into the world, and death by sinne, and so death passed upon all men, in which world all have sinned.* The Spirit of wisedome would not speak so, nor the God of order so disjointedly. The second exposition is as unlikely, and that readeth it, *In which death all have sinned:* but as * S. Augustine saith, *Men die in sinne, not sinne in death.* The phrase is improper: yet grant that some sinne in death, yet it is most untrue *That in death all sinne:* The third word to which *In whom*, or *which* may be referred, is *Sinne: In which sinne all have sinned*; and thus * Augustine did interpret it once. And if it were so to be read, it is all one in effect, to say, *In Adam all sinned*, and, *In which sinne* (of Adam) *all sinned.* But * Augustine afterward more accurately examining the place, rejecteth that exposition, and confirmeth another by the authority of S. Hilarie. And indeed Grammaticall construction overthroweth the sense: for ἁμαρτία is the feminine gender, to which the words ᾧ & can have no good reference. Therefore the last exposition is best, which renders it *In quo, In which* (Adam) *all have sinned.* So it is expounded by Hilarie, Augustine, and Ambrose; by Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and generally both by the Greek and Latine Fathers; and the Apostle strongly argueth for this sense, verse 19. *By one mans disobedience many were made sinners.* In him we sinned. And whoso shall throughly weigh both the precedent and subsequent dependances, must needs acknowledge that the words *In whom*, or *In which* do point at Adam onely; *in whom*, as in a masse, we were contained, and *in him* sinned. Photius thus, * *In this we our selves die with Adam, that our selves have sinned with him: he gave the beginning to sinne, — we have been helpers to him.* And, *Neither by the Devill, who sinned before the woman; nor by the woman, who sinned before her husband; but by Adam, from whom all mortality draweth its beginning, did sinne truly enter into the world, and death by sinne.* So farre Origen. Augustine likewise, * *In Adam all have sinned, when all were that one man.* So punctually speaketh he. For we were in Adam radically, seminally, representatively. Adam was our head; he did lead the whole body into evill: he was our parent; all the issue of him were disinherited by him. Augustine thus, * *We have all sinned in Adam willingly; not by our own will, but by his will with whom and in whom we were one man, and one will of all.* As the King represents the Kingdome, and the chief Magistrate the Citie, and the Master of the house the household; so did Adam represent us; and in him, and with him we sinned.

4. I can

* *In peccato moriuntur homines, non in morte peccant.* Aug. Cont. duas Epist. Pelag. 4.4.

* Aug. De Peccat. Merit. & Remiss. 1. 10.

* Vide Aug. Cont. 2. Epist. Pelag. 4.4.

* *In hoc ipsi Adam commoriuntur, quòd in ipso compeccaverunt: illi initium dedit peccato, —— nos adjutores illi fuimus.*

* *In Adamo omnes peccaverunt, quando omnes ille unus homo fuerunt.* Aug. De Baptismo parvulorum l. 10

* *Peccavimus omnes in Adamo voluntate, non voluntate nostrâ propriâ, sed voluntate illius cum quo & in quo eramus unus homo, atq; una omnium voluntas.* Aug. Epist. 23. Ad Bonifacium.

4. I can not part with this ſecond point, till I anſwer the objection, *Whether Chriſt were in Adam.* The doubt will be cleared by theſe two Poſitions. Firſt, *Chriſt may be ſaid to be in Adam ſome kinde of way.* Therefore the Evangeliſt derives Chriſts Genealogie from him, and he is ſaid to be *The Sonne of Adam*, Luke 3. 38. And if he be called *The Sonne of David*, as often he is, Matth. 21. 9. Mark 10. 47. Rom. 1. 3, *He was made of the ſeed of David according to the fleſh*: if *he took on him the ſeed of Abraham*, as he did, Heb. 2. 16, and *is fleſh of our fleſh and bone of our bones*, and *we of his*, Epheſ. 5. 30, it muſt needs be confeſſed, *He was in Adam.* Paracelſus talketh of *Non-Adami*, ſuch as deſcended not from Adams loyns: theſe, if ſuch, are monſters in nature, and as great a monſter in Divinitie is it, to ſay, that Chriſt was no way in Adam. I will enlarge this by a diſtinction. Chriſt was not in Adam, no, nor we neither, ſo, that our ſubſtances, or any part thereof, were really or materially in him. Yet, both Chriſt and we were in him. Firſt, becauſe mediatly we were born of him, and becauſe he was the efficient cauſe of generation; not the immediate, propinque, and proximous cauſe thereof, which neceſſarily communicateth ſome matter to that which is begotten: but he was the remote, mediate, yea the furtheſt, and moſt diſtant efficient naturall cauſe of all; from which it is not neceſſary that its matter reach to the hindermoſt effects. Secondly, becauſe if he had not begotten children, neither Chriſt in his humane nature, nor we now long after him, had ever been born. Thirdly, Chriſt took fleſh of the thrice-bleſſed Virgin Mary; and ſhe was in Adam, (as all others are, except Chriſt) ſhe was begotten by the concurrence and cooperation both of man and woman: and ſo, inasmuch as his holy Mother was in Adam, Chriſt in a ſort may be ſaid to be in Adam.* *Chriſt was of Adams kindred*, ſaith Holcot.

*Chriſtus fuit de genere Ade. Holcot. De Imputabilitate peccati.

The ſecond Poſition is thus, *Chriſt was not in Adam every manner of way, as we were.* For we differed in this peculiar ſort and manner, becauſe we were in Adam *ſecundum ſeminalem rationem, quâ, per communionem utriuſq; ſexûs, fit generatio.* For Adam could beget no childe without a femal ſex, which was one main reaſon of Eves creation: neither did ever daughter of Eve conceive without a different ſex (except onely that ſtupendious miracle of our Saviours Incarnation) And after this manner Chriſt was not in Adam. He had true fleſh from Adam; but it was onely *the liſiones* or ſimilitude *of ſinfull fleſh* that he had, Rom. 8. 3. All other fleſh, except his, is the fleſh of ſinne. Had he come from Adam every way exactly as wee do, he had had not onely true fleſh, as he had, but true ſinne alſo: but becauſe he had not *Patrem naturalem*, as Scotus phraſeth it, therefore, neither did he ſinne in Adam, nor was in Adam as we were.

Lombard

Lombard* enquireth, *Why Levi was tithed in Abraham, and not Christ, when each of them was in the loyns of Abraham, in regard of the matter.* He answereth, *The Leviticall order which was in Abraham according to the seed, descends from him by the concupiscence of the flesh: But Christ came not according to the common law, or lust of the flesh.* And he resolveth thus, *When Levi and Christ according to the flesh were in the loyns of Abraham, when he was tithed, therefore not Levi tithed, and not Christ, because Christ was not in the loyns of Abraham, after some manner or other that Levi was.* Moreover, how could Christ be tithed to Christ? how could the same, in the same regard, both pay and take? Melchisedec was a figure of Christ, and tithes by an everlasting law were due to the priesthood of Melchisedec, as is unanswerably proved by my reverend friend (now a blessed Saint, Doctor Sclater) against all sacrilegious Church-robbers. Therefore Christ was not to be tithed in Abraham, though Levi was. Yea, if Aaron, or Melchisedec himself had lived till Christ had come in the flesh, and lived with him; perhaps they would have resigned up, as it were, their Offices, and no more have taken tithes, or continuing in Office Sacerdotall under him, they would have taken tithes in his name, and for him. Aquine out of Augustine thus,* *after what manner was Christ was in Adam and Abraham, and in what Fathers, after the same manner there also, but not customarily.* And Aquine himself setteth his conclusion, *When the body of Christ was tithed in the Fathers, and so in Adam, tithed with it, this was not proper. Christ was not in them secundum aliquid signatum de perfectione naturæ, sed secundum originem.* Which, I imagine, he establisheth against such as (Lombard saith) did hold, *That when Adam descended by way of generation, some such part or parcell as of it Christs was would.* Against which Aquine argueth thus, (whether modestly enough and truly, let others judge) *The matter of Christs body was not the flesh and bone, or any other actuall part of the Ever-blessed Virgin, which made the blessed, which was potentia ordinata.* * *But what soever should from her parent be not actually part of her, but was part of Christs body. Nor was Christs body in Adam, and the other Fathers, secundum aliquid signatum,* so that any part of Adams body, or of the other Fathers, could determinately be point-blank, and be said to be the very exact individuall matter out of which Christs body was framed: but Christ was in Adam, *secundum originem* as others were. Whilst Christ was in the wombe of the most happy Virgin Mary, even many months before his delivery she was called, Luke 1.43. *Mother of my Lord:* which words, in part, Elisabeth took from David speculation, Psal. 110.1. *The Lord said unto my Lord.* Never woman was truly called or to be called a Mother, before she had delivered, except only the All-gracious Virgin Mary, who could not possibly suffer abortion, nor lose

*Lomb. lib. 3 dist. 3.

*Leviticus ordo qui in Abraham secundum rationem seminalem erat, ex eo per concupiscentiam carnis descendit: Sed Christus non descendit secundum legem communem, aut carnis libidinem.

*Quomodocunque Christus fuit in Adam & Abraham & in aliis Patribus, ali[illegible] etiam ibi fuerunt. Aquin. part. 3. quæst. 31. art. 6. ex Aug. De Gen. ad lit. lib. 10.

*Corpus Christi non seminaliter conceptum est, sed ex castissimis & purissimis sanguinibus. Aquinas ex Damasceno.

lose that *Blessed Fruit* of her wombe, by the sinne of man, or the punishment of mankinde for sinne: which was conceived in her, without the help of man or sinne, and was even then Lord of all things.

7 Another point followeth, to wit; *We sinned that sinne in Adam, not by imitation onely.* For Adam sinned, and in a sort imitated Eve, who sinned first, and ate of the forbidden fruit before him: yet it is not said, That in Eve Adam died, or many died in Eve, or Adam sinned through Eve. So likewise the Devill offended before Adam was, and Adams sinne did nearly in many particulars resemble the Devils: yet Adam died not by the sin of the Devil, though after a fashion he did imitate it. But it is said, Rom. 5. 15, *Through the offence of Adam many be dead*: and thereabouts, *In Adam all die.* Therefore this sinne of ours must needs be more then by imitation. And this is S. Augustines argument against Pelagius, *If it had been by imitation onely, The Apostle had not made Adam the beginning of sinne, but the Devill.* Against Julian, 6. 10. he useth this other argument in effect, *Who almost (yea, who at all?) thinketh of Adam, when he sinneth? whereas the imitator propoundeth himself a pattern to follow and imitate. Or what is Adams eating of an apple like unto witchery, blasphemy, murder, lying, or the like? and how there have been, yea are yet, many millions in the world, who never heard of Adam, much lesse of his sinne? and did they intend to imitate, or did they imitate him?* Thirdly, Augustine thus argueth, *As the second Adam (besides this, that we are to follow him, and imitate him) giveth his daily grace unto the faithfull; so (contrarily) are we sinners, and die not by the imitation onely of the first Adam, but by the secret blot and spot by which he hath infected us.* Fourthly, he thus disputeth in his 89 Epistle to Hieromo, *The Apostle saith, Rom. 5. 16. The fault is of One offence to condemnation: but he must have said, Indeed here of Many offences, and not of One, of all are condemned for their actuall & personall imitation of Adam, since the offences of many now must needs be more then the One offence spoken of by the Apostle.* Lastly, let me reason thus, Rom. 5. 14, *Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression.* But death was the wages of sinne. Therefore some died who did not resemble Adam in sinning. And there is a sinne not like to his, for Adams sinne was actuall, most voluntary, and personable. Children in sinning of originall sinne do not imitate Adam, for their sinne was onely implicit, in and with him; and they have not that absolute freedome of will that he had, and their sinne is rather naturall then personall. Yet, children die for sinne, and for such a sinne as is not after the similitude of Adams transgression: and so originall sinne cleaveth unto us, not by imitation onely. Augustine thus, *If imitation onely make sinners by Adam, onely imitators should make us just by*

Christ,

*Apostolus peccati principium non fecisse Adamum, sed Diabolum.

*De Peccat. Merit. & Remiss. 1. 9.

*Aug. De Peccat. Merit. & Remiss. 1. 15.

Christ, and then we Adam and Christ, but Adam and Abel should be compared. For Adam was the first wicked man, and just Abel, Hebr. 11.4. *the first just man: But these things are not thus. Therefore we sinned not onely by imitation of Adam.*

6 I come to a new point, namely, to prove, *That this sinne of Adam is not ours by imputation onely*; as if Adam alone had offended, and we were wholly cleare from that great sinne. Indeed Adams actuall first sinne, or his other sinnes after his repentance, as they were personall and private are not imputed to us. For he was to answer for himself as well as we are. If we repent, what doth our repentance help him? If he had not changed his minde, and turned to God, himself alone should have been condemned, as himself alone was saved by his own repentance. That Adam was by divine wisdome brought out of his fall, is said, Wisd. 10.1. * *He hath been restored to pardon*, saith S. August. And in the Tribe of Judah there is to this day a den, or hole called *Spelunca Adam, The Cave of Adam*, & in it a rock, in which are two stony beds of Adam & Eves and here they mourned (*as is delivered by Tradition*, saith Adrichomius) an hundred yeares for the murdered Abel. (*why not rather for their own sinnes*, say I.) This place is not farre from either *Agar Damascenus*, where they say Adam was made of that *Red earth*, which is *aura terra habilis*, saith Adrichomius, or from that place which to this day is shewen, and recorded to be the plat of ground which drank up Abels bloud, when Cain slew him. And though I deny not but they might mourn for the death of Abel, yet they were more bound to mourn for that sinne of theirs, which brought death both upon Abel, and themselves, and all their posterity.

That Adam was a Type of Christ is expressed, Rom. 5.15. and unfolded in many excellent particulars by * Salianus. That the more eminent Types of Christ should be saved, is evinced, because of their resemblance, and conformitie unto the Antitype: nor can it be proved, that ever any of his figures were condemned. For the shadow must follow the substance, and Christ that Proto-type being not onely saved, but called Jesus, because *he shall save his people from their sinnes*, Matth. 1.21. They are his people especially who in principal things resembled him: and wherein can they better resemble him, then in being blessed and saved as he was? But I return to Adam. Concerning Adam, Augustine saith thus, * *As for that first man, the father of mankinde, almost the whole Church agreeth, that* Christ being in hell, *he there delivered him*. Concerning his body, that it arose, as other Saints of the Old Testament arose, and that it was besprinkled with the bloud of Christ dying, shall be shewed hereafter. And if God had such care of Adams body, or part of it, he shall be impudently unreasonable that shall say his

* *Vocata reddita est.*

* *Sal. Ad annum 930.*

* *De illo quidem primo homine, patre generis humani, quid cæteri sentiamus, facile est ut arbitror, conjicere. Fere enim totus ecclesiasticus sermo.* Aug. Epist. 99. Ad Euodium.

his soul is not in blessednesse? Now, as his personall repentance saved himself onely, and not one of his offspring; so, if he had died unrepentant, his sinne or sinnes, as they were personall, should not have prejudiced one of his posterities salvation.

Bellarmine saith, *It was one of Tatians heresies, That our first parents were damned.* Indeed Irenæus l. 30. ascribes this opinion to Saturninus and Marcion, and chap. 31. to Tatianus the first founder of it. Tertullian in his book *De Hæresib.* towards the end, taxeth Tatian for the same opinion, and confuteth him thus, * *As if the branches being saved, the root also should not be saved.* But in his book *De præscript. adversus Hæreticos* (as it is cited by Bellarmine) there is no mention of Tatian, in Rhenanus his Edition. Augustine saith of the Tatians and Encratites, * *That they gainsay the salvation of the first man.* Where Bellarmine used another Edition then Eralamus his, or was mistaken in the collation. He who will see more into this point, let him consult with Bellarmine, in the place above cited, and Salianus *ad Annum Mundi* 930. where he justly taxeth Rupert for saying in this third book on Genes. chap. 21. * *That the salvation of Adam is freely denied by many, and by none strongly enough defended.* And he bringeth many authorities and proofs to the contrary. From Irenæus he bids them blush, for saying Adam was not saved: and more vehemently, *Thus by saying so, they make themselves Heretikes, and Apostates from the truth, and Advocates for the Serpent and Death.* God cursed not Adam and Eve, but the earth and the Serpent. Yea, before God pronounced any punishment against Eve or Adam, even in the midst of his cursing of the Serpent, with the same breath he both menaced Satan, and comforted Adam and Eve with the gracious promise of the Messiah, Genes. 3. 15. Now, there was never any, unto whom God vouchsafed a speciall promise of Christ, but they were saved. Indeed the Apostle reckoneth not Adam among the faithfull ones, Hebr. 11. but one reason of this omission is, because he entreateth of such faithfull ones onely as were much persecuted, which Adam was not, so farre as is recorded. If it be further objected, *That God is called* The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Exod. 3. 6. Matth. 22. 32. and in the where called The God of Adam, let it be answered, *That Adam is called* The Son of God, Luke 3. 38. And I think he is too severe a judge, who such a sonne of God is damned. The Targum or Chaldee Paraphrase (set forth by Rivius) on the Canticles chap. 1. vers. 1. saith, * *That the first soule that ever was made, was indued by Adam, in the time when his sinne was forgiven him.* Damascenus a Greek, *De Adoratione*, l. 4. *Ethiopian*, makes this the belief of Zagazabo and the Ethiopians, for whom he negotiated, *That Christs soul descended into Hell for Adams soul*

pag.

* Bell. De Amiss. Gratiæ 3. 12.

* *Quasi non, si rami salvi sint, & radix salva sit.*

* *Quid contradicunt primordium hominis saluti.* Aug. De Hæresib. cap. 25.

* *Salutionem Adami & à multis liberè negari, & à nullo satis fortiter defendi.*

* *Et variis diei Sabbati, & præcelsis nimis, & variis & diuinis Psalmis Canticulis Sabbati.*

pag. 93. *and that Adam was redeemed by Christ from Hell*, pag. 55. How glorious was it for Christ, to save his first sheep? and how would the Devil glorie, if it were otherwise? Adams fig-leaves may be thought to be sharp, afflictive, and penitentiall. Epiphanius, *Haref.* 46. calleth Adam *Holy*, and saith, *We beleeve he is among those Fathers, whom Christ reckoneth alive, not dead: God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.* Irenæus saith, *Adam humbly bare the punishment laid upon him.* Can humility be damned? then may pride be saved. Josephus 1. 2. recordeth, *That Adam foretold the universall destruction of the World, one by the flood, the other by fire.* And can the first of Mankinde, the first King, Priest, and Prophet of the World be condemned? Others probably conjecture, that before his death he called the chief of his children, grand-children, and their descendants, and gave them holy and ghostly counsel, as Abraham did, Genes. 18. 19. and Jacob, Genes. 49. 1. &c. and Moses, Deuteron. 31. 1. &c. Salianus fits him a particular speech at his death, and a witty Epitaph. Feuardentius, on Irenæus, thus relateth; *Nicodemus Christs Disciple, in the History ascribed to him* OF THE PASSION AND RESURRECTION OF THE LORD, *reporteth, That our Lord Jesus Christ, when he descended into Hell in his soul, spake thus to Adam, and held his hand,* PEACE BE UNTO THEE, WITH ALL THY SONNES, MY IVST ONES. *But Adam falling on his knees* (such spirituall knees as before his spirituall hand, which Christ held, while both their bodies were in the grave) *weeping ripe, thus prayed with a loud voice,* * *I will magnifie thee, Lord, because thou hast received me, and hast not made glad mine enemies over me: Lord God, I have cried unto thee, and thou hast healed me; Thou hast brought up my soul from Hell, thou hast saved me from those that go down to the pit.* Thus Salianus, in his *Scholia and Annots* 930. Another ancient Apocryphal book affirmeth, that Adam repented. Didacus Vega, in his second Sermon on the fifth penitentiall Psalme, pag. 443. thus. *Leonardus de Utino, in his Book De Legibus, Sermon de Penitentia, saith, That Adam repented not of his sinne, but remained obstinate till the death of Abel: but when he saw him lye dead at his feet, all wounded in his blood, and yet palpitating as in a glasse saw the deformity of death, he began to repent.* Strabo saith, *He was so sorrowfull, that he vowed chastity for ever, and would have performed it, if an Angel had not injoyned him the contrary. And from the authority of Josephus he saith, Adam was so sorry for Abel, that he wept an whole hundred yeares. But I beleeve,* saith Vega, *He rather wept for the cause, which was sinne, then for the very death of Abel.* Ludovicus Vertomannus, in his sixth Book, fourth Chapter, of his journey to India, hath recorded, that a Mahumetan Merchant told him, that at the top of an high mountain in the Iland of Zaylon, subject to the King of Narsinga, there is a den, in which Adam after his fall lived and con-

* *Exaltabo te, Domine, quoniam suscepisti me, nec delectasti inimicos meos super me: Domine Deus, clamavi ad te, & sanasti me; eduxisti ab inferis animam meam, salvasti me à descendentibus in lacum.*

continued very penitently. And though their tradition rests on an idle conjecture, because there is yet seen the print of the steps of his feet, almost two spannes long; (for how should they know they were his feet, rather then some giants?) and because, how Adam should come to this Iland, and why, cannot be shewed; yet, so farre as is probable, we will joyn issue with their beleef, to wit, *That he was penitent, and so saved.* Thus much be spoken concerning the salvation of Adams soul.

Concerning Adams actuall sinne, though I said truly before, That, as it was private and personall, it was not imputed to us; yet (I must needs say) as it was ideall and representative, it was and is imputed to us. He who denieth this, let him also deny, that Christs active and passive Merits are imputed to us. Neither can the Divine providence be taxed with rigour, much lesse with injustice, for imputing Adams sinne unto us. For first, he imputeth not our own actuall and personall iniquities, but forgiveth us both this sinne of Adam and all manner of our own sinnes. Secondly, he imputeth Christs Merits unto us, as if we our selves had done them. *For as by one offence of one, judgement came upon all to condemnation: even so by the righteousnesse of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life,* Rom. 5. 18. We are then not so accursed by the imputation of the first Adams transgression, as we are blessed by the imputation of the second Adams holines. Yet is this sinne originall not absolutely and simply imputed unto us, if we take imputation for laying to our charge the sinne of another, without any reference to any offence of our own: but it is imputed to us, as being both his sinne and ours, though we concurred in our kinde, and he in his; he by an explicit act of his will, we by an implicit of ours. In vertue of the masters will, the servant willeth, yea performeth many things. *He saith to one servant, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to a third, Do this, and he doth it,* Matth. 8. 9. In all transactions and negotiations, the wifes will is included in her husbands. The father selleth away lands of inheritance for ever from the sonne; and though the children be unborn, the childrens will was in the fathers, and bindeth them that yet are not. But of this, much more hereafter. So are we by Adam *sold under sinne,* Rom. 7. 14. *Which hath reference to the originall sinne of Adam,* saith Augustine in his Retract. *By one mans disobedience many were made sinners,* Rom. 5. 19. Not as Bath-sheba said, 1 Kings 1. 21. *We shall be counted offenders:* ἁμαρτωλοὶ, say the Septuagint; *Errabo, & reus ero,* saith the Hebrew; that is, in others estimate: but κατεστάθησαν, *Constituti sunt, Were made,* which is more then *onely esteemed sinners,* more then this, *That Adams sinne was imputed to us,* as excluding our own unrighteousnesse. For this originall sinne is not merely extraneall, [illegible] but a sinne that

that dwelleth in me, saith the Apostle, Rom. 7. 20. and *peccatum circumstans*, Heb. 12. 1. *which doth so easily beset us*; called also there a *weight*, as depressing us. That I may avoyd amphibologie, and open the point plain, conceive me thus; as original sinne is taken actively, for that sinne of Adam, to which our will involvedly concurred, and which caused sinne in us, it is called *Originale peccatum originans*: and again, as it is taken passively, for corruption traduced unto us, it is called *Originale peccatum originatum*: and both these wayes sinne may be said to be imputed to us, though somewhat differently. The former more properly is said to be imputed, the latter more properly is said to be propagated; yet both what Adam did, bearing our persons: what we did in his loyns, by a kinde of implicite blinde obedient disobedience; and what he propagated to mankinde, is all but onely one original sinne, partly imputed, partly inhoerent.

O Judge most righteous, O Father most mercifull, grant, I beseech thee, that all of us who have been made Sinners by the Disobedience of one, may likewise be made Righteous, and Sanctified, and Justified, and presented blamelesse before thee by the Obedience of one, of one thy onely Sonne, in whom thou art well pleased, our onely sweet Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

CHAP. VI.

1. *Originall sinne is propagated unto us. Originall sinne properly is not in the flesh before the union with the soul.*

2. *Bishop Bilson, Mollerus, Kemnitius, and Luther, in an error. Bishop Bilsons arguments answered. Conception taken strictly by Physicians, &c. We are not conceived in originall sinne, if we respect this conception. Conception taken largely by Divines. Thus we were conceived in sinne.*

3. *A Physicall Tractate of conception clearing the point.*

4. *A Discourse touching abortives and abortives. Balthasar Bambach answered. The Hebrew vowels not written at first when the consonants were. Never any wrote till God had written the Two Tables.*

5. *The manner how the soul contracteth originall sinne pointed at. Bodily things may work upon the soul.*

6. *Righteous men have unrighteous children. The contagion of originall sinne is quickly spread.*

7. *No sinne or sinnes of any of our parents immediat or mediat do hurt the souls of their children, but onely one, and that the first sinne of Adam.*

1 AT length we are come to shew, that original sinne is traduced and propagated unto mankinde; and this is evident. For since Adams aversion remained, and was rooted in the nature of him as an habit, and since we have our nature from him, as he had it, not [illegible] since sinne, this aversion is left in nature. And this nature is conveyed unto us by generation; conveyed (I say) as corrupt, and as sinfull: and so corrupt as flesh and blood can be, before a reasonable soul be united to it. So that we being in Adam *secundum causam seminalem, & propagandi virtutem*, our first father transmitted after his fall some corruption unto all his children. And this corruption was mingled with the whole nature of his posterity; neither could a man single out any part of any one, in which there was not some deal of that primitive corruption. And Adams offspring ever since hath made such a transmission as they received. As if one do throughly mingle a little leaven with a whole unleavened lump,

lump; not onely that masse may be said to be perfectly leavened, but whatsoever is afterward incorporated into that masse. Such a leaven of corruption was mingled by Adam, and spread or dispersed unto and by his posteritie: or as a needle toucht by a loadstone, imparteth its received vertue to other needles depending on it. From the will of every one of us, actuall sinne is derived to all the other parts and faculties both of our bodies and souls: so from the will of the first parents by generation is original sinne conveyed to all mankinde. Or rather thus, in Aquinas his words. * *The act of sinne exercised by the hand or foot, is not made sinne by the will of the hand or foot, but by the will of the whole man.* From which, as from a certain head or fountain, the motion of sinne is derived to every member: so from the will of Adam, who was the fountain of humane nature, the whole aberration of nature is found culpable in us. And the means he thus there describeth. *Though the soul be not in the seed, yet in it is a dispositive vertue apt to receive the soul, which when it is infused, is conformed to it so farre as it is capable, because* every thing received is in the receiver according to his capacitie.

* *Actus peccati exercitus per manum vel pedem non habet rationem culpæ ex voluntate manus vel pedis, sed ex voluntate totius hominis.* Aquin. in Rom. 5. Lect. 3.

* *Quicquid recipitur est in recipiente per modum recipientis.*

I need not doubt to say, That the corruption which the fleshly part draweth from our first parent, before the soul be united, is not sinne, but a punishment of sinne, a debilitie of nature, an effect of sinne. For if the Embryo should die, or suffer abortion before the infusion and unition of the reasonable soul, (as such a time there is, & such a thing may be: yet must appeare in judgement, and, without extraordinarie mercy, be damned, if there were sinne in it: but that a lump of flesh, which onely lived the life of a plant, at the utmost the life of a brute creature (for indeed some abortions, seeming liveteste lumps, being prickled have contracted themselves, and shewed they had sense) which never had reasonable soul or spirit, or life of man, (for those three severall lives are not onely virtually, but really distinguished) I say, that such a rude masse of flesh should be lyable to account, and capable of eternall either joy or pain, is strange Divinitie; which yet followeth necessarily, if sinne be in the seed, or unformed Embryo. But you may aske, *When sinne beginneth?* I answer, So soon as the soul is united. * *There is a reasonable subject susceptible of sinne*; and then sinne entreth. Original sinne is in the reasonable soul as in the proper subject, and is there formally: the fleshly seed is the instrumentall meanes of traduction, both of humane nature and originall sinne. Originall sinne (in a large sense) may be said to be in the flesh, and fleshly seed virtually, as in the cause instrumental, and to be in it originally, causally, materially; and in such sort to be sooner in the body then in the soul, by the order of generation and time: but exactly, and in most proper terms, sinne is sooner in the soul by the order of nature; and hath its first residence in the

* *Subjectum rationale peccati susceptibile.*

the substance of the soul, then in the facultie of it, and last of all in the body.

2 In Bishop Bilsons *Survey*, pag. 179. this Position following is produced, and maintained against him by his opposers, *Pollution, that is sinne and reall iniquity, is not in our flesh without the soul.* The Bishop answereth very copiously, *The soul cometh not to the body presently with the conception. Mothers and Midwives do certainly distinguish the time of quickning from the time of conceiving, neither doth the childe quicken presently upon conception. That the body is not straightway framed upon the conception, many thousand scapes in all females, and namely women do prove. Physicians and Philosophers interpose many moneths between the conception and the perfection of the body. Job saith, we were first as milke, then condensed as cruds, after clothed with skinne and flesh, lastly compacted with bones and sinews, before we received life and soul from God,* Job 10. 10. —— *The New Testament noteth three degrees in framing our bodies, Seed, bloud, flesh.* Upon the premisses he thus argueth. *If nothing can be defiled with sinne (as by your doctrine you resolve) except it have a reasonable soul, of necessitie we either had reasonable soules at the instant of our conception, which is a most famous falshood, repugnant to all learning, experience, and to the words of Job, or els we were not conceived in sinne, which is a flat heresie, dissenting from the plain words of the Sacred Scriptures, and from the Christian Faith.*

So farre Bishop Bilson. If company may extole his opinion, I adde these. First, Mollerus accordeth with him, that "□□ is to be referred to the time of conception, as soon as "ever it was conceived in the wombe; and □□ to the time "that the *fœtus* lieth hid, & is carried in the wombe, signifying "the seed was impure, the conception was not without the "flames of concupiscence, and all the masse of bloud that nou-"risheth the Embryo, was defiled with vices in the wombe: and "lastly, the masse of the Embryo, when in the first ardor of "conception it first began to be warmed by the wombe, was "contaminated with sinne. Enough of Mollerus. Henrhius in his *Examen ad tractat. de origin. peccati*, pag. 191. thus, ** When the masse of the Embryo, at the first ardor of conception, began to be warmed and cherished by the heat of the wombe, it was already defiled with sinne, which defilement, according to Davids confession, was truly sinne, when as the instruments of the minde, as of the will, &c. as the heart were not yet framed.* Luther, on the words *In iniquitatibus concepit me*, thus, ** David speaks not of any workes, but simply of the matter and being, and he saith, The humane seed of which I have been conceived, is all corrupted with vice and sinne. The mother self is infected: that clay of which this vessel that began to be fashioned, is damnable: the fruit in the wombe, before we be born and beginne to be men, is sinne.* Hierom, in his Commentary on the words,

* *Cùm massa Embryonis, in primo ardore conceptionis, primùm incipe-ret uteri calore foveri, jam erat peccato contaminata; quæ contaminatio, juxta Davidis confessionem, habebat veram rationem peccati, cùm nondum formata essent vel mentis, vel voluntatis, vel cordis organa.*

* *Non loquitur David de ullis operibus, sed simpliciter de materia & ipso esse; & dicit, Semen humanum, id est, massa ex qua conceptus sum tota est vitio & peccato corrupta. Materia ipsa vitiata est: intus illud ex quo vasculum hoc fingi cœpit, damnabile est: fœtus in utero, antequam nascimur & homines esse incipimus, peccatum est.*

words, * *What soever is drawn and derived from Adam, is conceived and born in originall sinne.* Cajetan thus, * *This is the Text from which originall sinne is deduced, wherein every one is said to be conceived in originall sinne by the conjunction of male and female.*

All this shall not make me beleeve, that there is sinne and real iniquity without a reasonable soul. Illyricus is justly deserted, for saying, *The very substance of the soul is sinfull.* And these deserve as few followers, who say, *That the substantiall, bodily, soul-wanting masse is sinfull.* And I professe in this latter to take part with others rather, then with the otherwise most Reverend and learned Bishop. For * *There can be no sinne in a thing reasonles.* Unto Bishop Bilson I thus answer, That all his premisses are true, that I subscribe to his opinion, in the first member of his disjunction. The second part of it I do wholy deny, nor do I fear his aspersion of heresie. To the place of the Psalmograph, I answer with reverence by distinguishing. First, that the words *sinne* and *iniquitie* are taken rather for *inclinations to sinne*, then for *sinne properly so called*: thus we were conceived in sinne, that is, so soon as ever we were conceived, we had a propension and aptitude to sinne, such and as much as the flesh was then capable of. Augustine thus, * *Albeit a stall be void of reason, yet even of them we say oft, that they ought to be beaten when they sinne.* But let us leave the vulgar forms of speech. The said Father annexeth, * *To sinne, properly is but of him that useth the pleasure and liking of a reasonable will.* Secondly, If you will needs take sinne according to its true definition, then I distinguish of conception; which is used either strictly and properly, or at large and extensively. The first way is followed by Naturalists, Anatomists, Physicians, and Philosophers; the second way by Divines. The first way, they make conception to be an action of the wombe: for when the wombe hath begun its work with attraction,

(*Nam sitiens hausit Venerem, intrinsq; recondit*)

and continued it, both by permixtion thereof and immuring retention; in the fourth and last place it ends the operation by the suscitation of the inclosed sperme, which is properly called * *conception.* The *Spiritus artifex*, and the *fœtus* onely formeth, nourisheth, and increaseth what is done afterwards: the wombe onely containeth, and therefore conserveth, because the place is the conservation of the thing placed in it. To say, that we did sinne properly, when our mother thus conceived us, is to say we sinned before we had life: and we may aswell be said to sinne while we were in our fathers seed, (before their conjunction and commixture with our mothers, which is not an houre before conception) and so in their bloud before seed, and in their meat ere it was bloud. Thus, I dare say, the Spirit of God never meant that we were conceived in sinne, and the traduced matter

* *Concipitur & nascitur in originali peccato quod ex Adam trahitur.*

* *Hic est textus unde trahitur originale peccatum, quo scilicet ex commixtione maris & fœminæ conceptus dicitur in originali peccato.*

* *Culpa non potest esse in re irrationali.*

* *Etsim jumenta, quæ, utpote rationis experia tamen plerumq; judicemus debere vapulare cum peccant.* Aug. De Adulterinis Conjugiis lib. 1. circa medium.

* *Proprie peccare, non est nisi ejus qui utitur rationali voluntate arbitrio.* Holcot, *De Imputabilitate Peccati*, mendosè legit argumento.

* Vide Laurentii *Filior. Anatomicam* lib. 1. quæst. 2. pag. 619.

matter is not properly full of sinne, or sinneth at all. But take we conception largely, and as Divines do use the word, (for the preparatorie formation, or a degree of it, is a kinde of conception; as the exact formation unto the full grown measure, a little before the nativitie, may be called the completorie conception) we may be said to be conceived in sinne; conception being taken for the time of our perfecter formation, extendible almost to our nativitie. *In iniquitatibus conceptus sum*, saith Lyra, * *Because man descending from Adam by carnall generation, in the union of the soul with the body contracts original sinne, which inclineth to actuall sinnes.* Tremellius hath it, *In iniquitate formatus sum, & in peccato fovit me mater mea*: and expounds it in this manner, * *I am guiltie of iniquitie and sinne, being framed and warmed in the wombe; for these pertain not to the form of the conception, shaping, and warming, but to the constitution of the fruit.* Vatablus rendreth it, *In iniquitate genitus sum*------, and interprets it, * *I have been fashioned, framed, born.* * *Conceived me, that is, brought forth*, saith Emanuel Sà, out of Hirome, though I finde it not so in Hierom on the place. S. Augustine following the Septuagint, with Theodoret and others, for the reading *In iniquitatibus conceptus sum*, hath these passages, * *The very band of death is grown together with sinne it self: None is born without drawing punishment, without drawing the merit of punishment*: and he doth in a sort parallel this place with an other place of the Prophet (and it is in Job, I ghesse, who may well be stiled a Prophet) *Nemo mundus in conspectu tuo, nec infans, cujus est unius diei vita super terram*, Job 15. 14. Our English late Translatours vary thus, *I was shapen in iniquitie, and in sinne did my mother conceive* or warm *me*, as it is in the margin: which shaping and warming is also, after the union of the reasonable soul to the body. Not one of all these doth take conception strictly and physically, but largely, and significantly enough both to the Scripture and to our purpose. Stapleton thus, * *The soul, not the flesh, is the subject of vertues and vices.* Augustine, * *The seed is infected, not infection.* Godfridus Abbas Vindocinensis, * *The death of the soul went not before from the corruption of the flesh; neither doth the Devil infect the flesh before he defile the soul.* Augustine, * *The corruptible flesh doth not make the soul sinfull, but the sinfull soul makes the flesh to be corruptible.* Thus it was in Adam, is in vs: our flesh is not properly sinfull or defiled before the soul inhabit it. Reason also is of our side; for if so soon as there is conception in the wombe, there is true sinne, how many thousand conceptions miscarry, and never come to perfect formation? as in the *Mola*, where the forming of the parts being begun can not be perfected, but (the weak workman being drowned in abundance of blood) in stead of a living creature is ingendred an ill shaped, hard, and idle lump of flesh, oppressing the wombe with its pon-

* *Qui: homo descendens ab Adam per carnalem generationem, in unione animæ ad corpus contrahit peccatum originale, quod est ad actualia peccata inclinativum.*

* *Iniquitatis & peccati rens sum; in utero formatus & fotus; hæc enim non ad formam conceptûs, formationis, & fœtus, sed ad fœtûs constitutionem pertinent.*

* *Fictus sum, formatus sum, natus sum.*

* *Concepit me, id est, peperit.*

* *Ipsum vinculum mortis cum ipsâ iniquitate concretum est: nemo nascitur nisi trahens pœnam, trahens meritum pœnæ.*

* *Anima, non caro, est subjectum virtutum & vitiorum.* Stapl. De Orig. Peccato 1.4.

* *Semen vitiat: non est, non vitiatur.* Aug. Hypognost. 2. initio.

* *Non ex carnis corruptione animæ mors processit; nec Diabolus prius carnem nostram infecit quàm animam.* Godfridus Abbas Vind. Epist. 39.

* *Non caro corruptibilis animam peccatricem, sed anima peccatrix facit esse carnem corruptibilem.* De Civit 14.3. circa medium.

ponderousness, (saith he) as the stomach is loaded with indigestible meats is there sin in this conception? sin before life? sin when there is no motion? (as there is none in the lumpish *Mola*) sin in a Mock-calf? But put we the case, in a perfect conception, which without miscarriage may come to formation, birth, and actually suffereth abortion before the soul be united, yet it can never be proved, that it sinned *in* & *ab* the conception.

Fernel. *De Hominis Progressione* 7. 8.

The arguments that trouble that way are these, *That every seed, of which we were begotten and conceived, was an unclean thing* (saith Bishop Bilson) *as Job calleth it, saying, Who can make an clean thing of an unclean?* Job 14. 4. *It is also corruptible, that is* (saith he) *full of corruption, as Peter meaneth it, when he saith, born again, not of corruptible seed*, 1 Peter 1. 23. *of which also we have had fathers of our flesh. Thirdly, The Apostle calleth our flesh, the flesh of sinne*, Rom. 8. 3. If by these places he take uncleanness, corruption, and sinne, improperly, for such ill dispositions as seed, blood, and liveable flesh is capable of, the Question is ended: I confesse all. But he understandeth uncleanness, corruption, and sinne, properly. The title of his pages 124. and 125. is this, *Mans flesh is defiled in conception, before the soul is created and infused.* And in the body of his Discourse he enlargeth it as in his Conclusion to the Reader, at the end of his Sermons, page 252. he first propoundeth it, and citeth Ambrose to assist him, saying, * *Pollution sooner beginneth in man then life. Now the soul is the life of the body; then if pollution cleaveth to the flesh before life comes, and consequently before the soul come, whensoever it cometh, it is evident that Adams fleshly flesh, and so condemneth us.* So farre he.

* *Prius incipit in homine macula quàm vita.* Ambr. Apolog. David cap. 11.

None of these proofs reach home to cleare this; That sinne, true sinne, proper sinne, originall sinne or actuall is in the seed, or blood, or flesh, before the reasonable soul be united. Neither did that learned Bishop consider, that it can not be called our originall uncleanness, pollution, or sinne, till we have *originem*, that is, till our soul hath its first being in the body. He erreth to say, *Pollution cleaveth to the flesh before life cleaveth*: and more erreth, saying, *Adams flesh defileth and condemneth us*, if he make the flesh subject to condemnation, before its life and union of the soul: For then many thousand abortions should be damned, which never had rationall soul annexed to them. As for Ambrose, Whitaker cites him from the same Book and Chapter, *Before we be born, we are stained with contagion; before we enjoy the light, we receive the injuries of our vaine beginning.* Ambrose saith not, *We have sinne ere we have life*, but, *We are conceived in iniquity*: which is true, and confest, if we take conception largely: so Ambrose calleth *maculæ*, for such inclination to evill as is in the seed potentially maculative.

a Whitak. De Origin. Peccato l. 4. *Priùs quàm nascimur, maculamur contagio; antequam lucem aspiciamus, vitiamur. Antequam vivere incipiamus, vulneramur injuriâ.*

Concerning the place of Job: First, Job saith not, *The seed is unclean*, but, *Quis dabit mundum ex immundo?* Which may have reference

reference to the person, or the nature of the unclean father. Secondly, it may be a parallell with that of Job 25.4. *How can he be clean, that is born of a woman? yea the starres are not pure in his sight*, verse. 5. Lastly, things may be said to be unclean, that have no sinne. Ask the *unclean beasts*, and they will justifie it, and the trees will send forth this truth as leaves. Levit. 19.23,24. *The fruit of the trees planted shall be as uncircumcised* (or unclean) *unto you three yeares, it shall not be eaten of: but in the fourth yeare it shall be holy, to praise the Lord withall:* yet was not the fruit sinfull it self, but *quoad nos*.

The place of S. Peter is answered by the same Apostle, 1 Pet. 1.18. *Silver and gold are things corruptible*, yet these creatures, as creatures, are good in themselves; & though they are causes of most sinnes, yet have no sinne: & many other corruptible things, as heaven & earth, are void of all sinne. As concerning the place of the Apostle S. Paul, I answer, it is apparent he speaketh of flesh, after the soul is united; which is nothing to our Question, and therefore a most impertinent proof of the Bishop. Lastly, the Reverend Bishop bringeth this objection against himself. *How could David say he was conceived in sinne, when at the conception he had neither soul nor body?* His main answer is, *With God nothing is more frequent, then to call those things that are not, as though they were*, Rom. 4.17. *and speaketh in Scriptures of things to come, as if they were past or present. David and Job call that seed which was prepared to be the matter of their bodies, by the names of themselves, because it could not be altered what God had appointed. But the vaid conceptions of women which miscarry before the body be framed, never had either life or soul, and so neither name nor kinde, but perish as other superfluous burdens and repletions of the body.* So he. I reply, (that I may not question the worthy Bishop about the meaning of that place, Rom. 4.17.) He hath made a great stirre to little purpose, since he maketh many conceptions void of sinne or punishment, like superfluous burdens and repletions of the body, which none ever said to have sinned. Secondly, which is the better answer to the place of the Psalmist, to say, as the Bishop doth, *Conceptions which come to nothing are not sinfull, but such as may have soules are sinfull before they have soules*, (whereby he splitteth himself on this rock. *That a perfect conception susceptible of a soul, and shaped casually before the unition with the soul, is sinfull and liable to account.*) or to answer with me, *That sinne and iniquity in the place of the Psalmist is taken for the aptitude to sinne, which is in the matter*; or els, conception is taken in its latitude, for our time in the mothers wombe; and so true originall sinne not to be in the body without a soul. Aquine saith, * *Sith none but the reasonable creature is susceptible of fault, the childe conceived is not subject to sinne before the infusion of a reasonable soul.* Whitaker saith well, * *That the flesh covets nothing without*

* *Quum sola creatura rationalis sit susceptiva culpæ, ante infusionem animæ rationalis proles concepta non est peccati obnoxia.* Aquin. part. 3. Quæst. 27. art. 2. in corp. art.

* *Certum nihil concupiscere sine anima, nec dubium, nec dubitat, ut loquar cum Augustino.* Quid enim caro animis à trunco differt? Whitak. *De Origin. Peccato* 3.1.

mit from the soul, yet by the learned nor the unlearned doubts, that I may speak with Augustine, For what doth the inanimate flesh differ from a stock? And I hope the Bishop will not say, a block or a stock hath sinne. Moreover, after thousands of sinnes committed in the body, and by and with the body, yet the body separated from the soul hath no sinne, is not sinfull, much lesse is sinne; and shall the seed in the wombe be called *sinfull* or *sinne*, as Kemnitius or Luther calleth it, before it is quanted with life or enlivened with a soul? Lastly, in our very *Creed* conception is used with libertie and freedome, and not narrowly imprisoned: *Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.* Where conception includeth in itself formation of the bodily parts, and union of the soul: So *Eve conceived, and bare Cain*, Genes. 4. 1. *and Cain his wife conceived, and bare Chanoth*, vers. 17. Again, Genes. 16. 11. the Angel saith to Hagar, *Concepisti & paries filium*, *Thou art with childe*, saith our late Translation, *and shalt bear a sonne*. And usually in the Scriptures there are onely made two degrees of mans nativitie. First, conception, wrapping within it the verge generation, with all degrees of formation, nutrition and augmentation. Secondly, birth or bringing forth. Whereupon they often runne in couplers together, *Concepit & peperit*, where conception is extended unto our nativitie. Let this suffice against Bishop Bilson and his partisans, Mollerus and others, *That conception is taken by Divines, in a full unrestrained sense.*

3. Let us now with Physicians say somewhat of conception, as it is taken natively, physically, properly, and formally. Though I never met with any who doth exactly set down the beginning, progresse, and end of conception, with its infallible bounds and limits of time, and wholy agrees with his fellows; yet out of their manifold diversitie I have gathered enough to justifie, that conception is within a very short time of coition, when it is impossible there should be sinne properly, unles the seed in the bodies of mankinde be sinfull, or the soul be tradocted by the seed, which Bishop Bilson justly explodeth. That which we call *conception*, Physicians call [illegible] which descendeth from [illegible] which reception is in a short time: then followeth permission, whereupon * *The seed liveth no lesse then a part of the mothers body: for by vessels (which are receptacles) it is as finally ingrafted into the body of the mother, as a scyenie into the stock of a tree, which doth still flourish and is full of life.* And Hippocrates calleth it [illegible] for upon commission is life: and this some do call *a conception*. Galen seems to make conception, one and the same with comprehension and retention. If so it be, since retention is immediately upon commission, (if not before, or at it) conception cannot be long deferred. Lastly, if conception be a distinct action from the receiving

* Non minus vivit semen, quàm quædam pars corporis materni manquet per vasa (quæ sunt receptabula) corpori materno fibrâ sic inserita, ut arboris trunco ramus, qui viresit adhuc, & vita tenetur.

ceiving a conception, and from the perfection of the conception, and from the retention of the integral or perfected. If conception be *the Coniugation of the seminal seed to the shaping of the fœtus*, and be the fourth severall action of the wombe, as Laurentius hath it. I say, grant all this, yet, since the distance of time betweene these actions is very short, conception must needs be shortly *post veniam purificationis*. Some say, within seven houres, I say, almost presently: but let him that doubteth have recourse to Physicians, and to the excellent description of conception made by the learned Peraclius. For I will passe from this point, wherein you see, how great a difference there is betweene conception, as God in Holy Writ speaketh of it, with Divines accordingly using the word; and as man describeth it naturally: and I now come to speak of abortives.

4. Job maketh two kindes of abortives, which the Latines also do curiously discern and distinguish by the severall words *Abortus* and *Abortus*. (the lofty and learned Bolducus is my Author) the former is more secret and kept close, the latter exposed more to sight and knowledge: and being ripe for birth, it die before, is called *Exenterismus* by Festus. The former is liveleſſe & formleſſe, the latter living, and formed before abortion: the former aborted within 40 dayes upon conception, the latter, after distinguishable organization. *The aborsives had no graves kept in remembrance of them*, (saith Lorinus on Eccles. 6.3. as Bolducus on Job 3.16. citeth him) *the abortives had, the aborsives had no graves properly so called, but the abortives had. The former indeed were allowed a burial place, though not properly a grave.* Fulgentius, *De Fide ad Petrum*, saith, *The Ancients did call the places of infants burial*, Suburcutium. They could not call them *ossa*, because they had not bones which might be burnt; nor could they be named *Tumuli*, because they were so small, that the place did not *tumescere*. Therefore the Vulgar did not so aptly read it, Job 10.19. *Translatus ad tumulum*: it had been more properly, *ad suggrundarium*. Our English late Translation hath it, *To the grave*. And though the word and noun *Keber*, there used, commeth of the verb *Kabar*, which signifieth *sepelire*, (some comparing it to its transposit and anagram *Kabah*, which signifieth to *rot*, or *putrifie*) and full often denoteth the sepulchres and graves in the Holy Writ: yet, perhaps, it would better have forced to the ancient custome of interring untimely births, if they had read it, *I should have been carried from the wombe to my burying place*, and omitted the grave, as being the receptacle of greater bodies. Job wisheth he had been like the first of these, Job 10.18. and saith of it, *I should have been as though I had not been*, vers. 19. Semblably, Job 3.16. *As an untimely birth I had not been*, and in reference to the speedy, and secret removing it from out of sight, Job there calleth

* *Vnificatio fœcundi seminis ad formandum fœtum.*
* Laurent. *Histor. Anatom.* 8.4.

* Fernel. *De Hominis Procreatione* 7. 8.

calleth it *an hidden untimely birth*. To the second sort Job wisheth he had been like, Job 3.11. *Why died I not from the wombe?* (as our late Translatours have it, agreeable to the Hebrew, word for word) but the sense is hit by the Septuagint, ἐκ κοιλίας, and the Vulgat, *In utero*. To which second sort also the Preacher pointeth, Ecclesiastes 6.3. saying thus, *If a man beget an hundred children, and live many yeares, ----- and his soul be not filled with good, and also that he have no buriall, I say, an untimely birth is better then he*. If any one wonder, why Job desired to be like each of the untimely births, and why Solomon should preferre an abortive before an unburied churl: when David curseth his enemies with this curse of God, Psal.58.8. *Let them be like the untimely birth of a woman, that may not see the sun*: (which indeed is an heavy imprecation, as may appeare by the rest of the curse unfolded in these similitudes, *Break out the great teeth of the young lions, ô Lord*, vers.6. and vers.7. *Let them melt away as waters, which runne continually: when he bendeth his bow, to shoot his arrows, let them be as cut in pieces*; and vers.8. *As a snail which melteth, let every one of them passe away*) you are to know, that *Job did it* ἐκ τῶν πόθων, saith Tremellius; *and the Preacher, ex ratione carnis*, saith the same; that is, (as I interpret him) *out of carnall reasoning*: he might rather have said, *ratione carnis*, because the flesh of the abortive was buried, and the churls carcase unburied. Nor let any man thwart me, by saying, that in the Septuagint is no such matter, but the words are, Συνεπεσεν πυρ (ἐν αὐλῇ) and the Vulgat accordeth, *Supercecidit ignis*, and the whole troups both of Greek and Latine Fathers so read it, and so expound it: I answer ingenuously, that (ascribing so much as I do to the Septuagint and Vulgat) I wondred, how there should be so great difference from the uncorrupt originall. The Vulgat (thought I) trusted to the 70. and the 70. to some Hebrew Copy varying from others more perfect. The 70 rendred, Gen. 4.8. not according to the Hebrew (*which is certainly defective, saith Varablus, and somewhat is to be understood*; for indeed there is an extraordinary pause) but according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, Cain said unto his brother, *Let us go into the field*, as Mr. Selden evinceth, by the authority of Hierom and Cyrill of old, and by a Samaritan Copy, now in the hands of Bishop Usher: which the Hierusalem Targum amplifieth, relating, *That Cain told Abel there was no future world, nor reward for goodnesse, nor punishment for sinne: all which Abel contradicted: and thereupon Cain slew him*. So might the 70, or the Vulgar, or both, translate the passage of the Psalmist, not accordant to those Copies which are now in price, but answerable to some other Hebrew one. At length I rested assured, that the Copies which they used, differed onely in one letter, and in the points. For in stead of נפל with five points (as it is most commonly read) and

with six points, saith Kimchi, (which signifieth *abortivus*, and is in the Psalmist) their Copies had it נפל, which signifieth *recidit*, there being the same Radicals, and no letter changed: Secondly, for אשת, *mulieris*, which is in David, they read אש, which signifieth *fire*: the omission onely of one letter ת, hath caused *abortivus mulieris* to be translated *cecidit ignis*. For as for the variety of punctations, that is of small moment, by reason of their often interchangings and easie mistakings; and points were not used in the dayes of the Septuagint; (as some say) scarce when the Vulgat first was, (as others say) not from the beginning (say I) if the names of the points and accents be Syriacall. Drusius in his Henoch, chap. 1. saith, *Hieronymus ante Masoritarum tempora, à quibus apices habemus (ut communis opinio est) qui nunc in usu, vixit.* Mercer in the great Dictionary of Pagnine, on the word ארר relates, that when the Chaldee translates, Deuter. 26. 5. *Laban Syrus quærebat perdere patrem meum*; and when the Vulgat rendred it, *Syrus persequebatur patrem meum* (whereas indeed it ought to be read, as it is in our last Translation, *A Syrian ready to perish was my father*) *non est dubium* (saith he) *quin sine punctis, quibus tunc carebant Biblia, legerint in Pihel, non in Kal.* Yea, *Sine dubio novas literas habemus*; if we may beleeve Bellarmine, *De Verbo Dei*, 1. 1.

And indeed, the three *fundamenta* laid by Balthasar Bambach, That the points were coëtaneall to the Hebrew letters, are founded on the sands. First, saith he, *Sine vocalibus consonantes proferri non possunt, & omnis lingua, qua illis destituta est, manca, imperfecta, & mutila efficitur.* What of all this? how followeth this, *Because the consonants cannot be pronounced without vowells; therefore the vowells were underwritten?* Let him know, the Hebrew Tongue was most perfect, when it was least written, and till Moses his time there were not so much as consonants written, (how soever they fable of a *pillar* written upon long before) for God invented the *letters* first, when he made his *Two Tables*, and writ the *Law* in them. See this proved by our learned Whitaker, saying, "*God himself hath shewed an example and manner of writing, when he deliveredto Moses the Law written with his own fingers. So Chrysostom and Theophylact write on the first of Matthew, and the Papists in their Confession, &c.* But though Eusebius, *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 10. saith, *Moses first taught the use of letters to the Jews*, yet Saint Augustine, *De Civitate* 15. 23, saith, Enoch wrote "*some divine things*; since Saint Jude testifieth so much. But that ever honoured Father considered not, that Jude said onely *Enoch prophesied*, which he might do by saying onely, and not writing; as Adam, Genes. 2. 24. yea God himself prophesied of Christ in Paradise, Genes. 3. 15, which Moses first wrote (for ought that we know:) and S. Judes words are,

Enoch

"Deus ipse scribendi exemplum, atque ratiocinationem ostendit, quando Legem suis digitis conscriptam Mosi tradidit. Sic Chrysost. & Theophylact. in 1 Matth. & Papistæ in confess. Petrocoviensi, cap. 15, & Screckius Jesuita, Thes. 13, De Verbo Dei; Whitak. De Script. Controvers. 1. quæst. cap 2.

"Nonnulla divina.

Enoch prophesied, saying; in which writing is rather excluded then included. Drusius in his Enoch cap. 27, saith, *There was a book called* LIBER BELLORUM DOMINI, *out of which Moses bringeth a testimony*. Cornelius à Lapide saith, *It was written before the Pentateuch*. Aben Ezra saith, *The book was in the dayes of Abraham*. In the book of Job, who lived before Moses, is mention of *writing*, and of *books*, as of things common, and of *graving in stone with a pen of iron*. Cusanus prinketh higher: in his *Compend*, chap. 3. pag. 241. he saith, *Our first parents had the art of writing; since by it man hath many helps, for things past and absent are by it made present*. By the same reason he may say, *Adam knew the art of Printing, of Brachography, of Characters*. Let us passe by the unauthorized vain fancy of Cusanus, and answer the objection drawn from Jobs book: which if it were written by his three friends, or *their Scribes, at their dictate*, as saith Bolducus the Carthusian (since they could make Job no better satisfaction then to historifie his innocency, and their own petulancy) or if by Elihu the Buzite (as is very probable: for he was young when they were old, Job 32. 6. and might well live till after the writing of the Pentateuch, and publishing of books) or by Job himself, for *Job himself might have conferred in Midian with Moses*, saith Bolducus; *who also died but thirteen yeares before Moses died*, saith that Carthusian: yea Job lived after Moses, if he lived 248 yeares (as the Septuagint and Olympiodorus do account.) And certainly, after all Jobs misery, he lived in prosperity 20 yeares longer then the whole yeares of Moses (compare Job 42. 16. with Deuter. 33. 7.) and so Job might know the writing of the Law in Tables of stone, and the other Sacred Writings of Moses; perhaps also books of other men, to which he alluded; and yet there was no writing before the Law. Concerning the book, Numb. 21. 14. suppose the word runne in the present tense, *Dicitur, It is said in the book of the Warres of the Lord*, yet it is expounded by the Chaldee as of a thing past, *What God did in the Red Sea, and in the brooks of Arnon*, which latter clause necessarily implyeth, that the book was written after the Law; for *The battle of Arnon was the fourtieth yeare after their Exodus*, saith a Jew, by Vatablus his commendation, very eminent. Or say it be read (as Robert Stephen, in his Annotations on the Pentateuch, gathered from the Kings Professours at Paris, hath it) *Sicut fecit in Mari Rubro, sic fecit in torrentibus Arnon*, which sense Cornelius à Lapide embraceth; yet those words evince, that the book was written since their going out of Egypt, *which was but fourty dayes before the giving of the Law*, saith Helvidius. But indeed, first, the word *Sepher* doth not alwayes signifie a book, but sometimes a Narrative of things past; whereupon Tremellius readeth it, *Idcirco dicitur*, In NARRATIONE BELLORUM JEHOVÆ: And *so then it have held*,

held, saith Vatablus; plainly denying, that there was ever any such especiall book of warres. Others read it in the future, *It shall be read*, and thereupon some of the Jews think it is the Book of Judges, which handleth the Warre with Amalek; or another book which recounted the miracles of God in the Red Sea, and by the river Arnon: which book, perhaps, is now perished, as divers others of the holy Scriptures, and amongst them, a book made by Samuel, 1 Samuel 10.25. Which I wondred that neither Drusius, nor any who handled the controversies, whom I could yet meet with, ever observed before me. And indeed Jeamar is the future tense, *It shall be said*, or, *it shall be written*. So Vatablus, the Interlineary, Eugubinus, and the Genevians. So the words are rather prophetically then historically: and so no particular book of the warres of the Lord was written before the two Tables. Lastly, that I may leave no objection unanswered, adde this to the answer of S. Augustine, That Christ, speaking of a prophesie in Paradise concerning himself, doth not say, *It was written before Moses*, but, *It is written by Moses of me*, John 5.46. Moreover, if we can read the Hebrew now without vowels, much easier and better could they whose daily speech it was. The necessity of pronouncing the consonāts by the vowels, evinceth not the writing of consonāts; the necessity of writing the Hebrew tongue by consonants evinceth not the necessity of writing vowels: they may be of a later invention.

Secondly, saith he, * *Seeing that the two tongues, the Syriack and the Arabick, which came from the Hebrew, have vowels, as it appeareth out of manuscripts and printed books, it is not likely that the Mother-tongue, to wit the Hebrew, wants them.* I answer it followeth not, *Because the Syriack & Arabick have now points; therefore they had ever so when they were written*: and if they had ever points, it is likely they invented them, and added them to their consonants, the rather because the Hebrew wanted them.

Thirdly, * *We must needs hold that tongue to be certain, and no way ambiguous or doubtfull, in which God hath published his sacred Oracles.* I answer, Then God should have writ in any other language: for the Hebrew, of all other is most dubious and ambiguous. And whereas he addeth, *That the Hebrew without vowels hath no certain signification, but from the antecedent and consequent; and admitteth three, foure, or five significations, according to the diversity of vowels*: I answer, the antecedents and consequents are guides sufficient, and God did it purposely to exercise our wits, and to make us know, that though in things necessary to salvation the Scripture is easy, yet in some matters there are depths not to be sounded: in others, *The lips of the Priest should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth*, Malach. 2.7. which the unlearned scorn now adayes to do, though there be much ambiguitie: but how bold, daring, self-

* Quum duæ linguæ Syriaca & Arabica, quæ ab Hebræa ortæ sunt, vocales habeant, ut ex libris manuscriptis & impressis apparet; Matrem nempe Hebræam, illis carere verisimile non est.

* Quâ Linguâ Deus Sacra sua oracula promulgavit, hanc certam minimèq; ambiguam esse necessariò statuendum est.

self-willed would they be, if there were no difficulties?

I return from the words to the matter, and say, That as the strong births of the wombe are a blessing of God, whether in women, or in beasts, Deuter. 30. 9. So an abortion is a curse; and abortives (I mean that had life and reasonable souls) by the ordinary rules of Genes. 17. 14. when Circumcision was in force, and of John 3. 5. whilest Baptisme is in force, is a fearfull estate. Howsoever God may dispense with his own Law, and shew mercy extraordinarily; yet David, when he wished his enemies to be like abortives, wished them no good, but evill: yea, if he did not curse them, but foretold what they should be like; and that they were not the words of imprecation, but prediction; yet he did not fore-divine, or fore-prophesie any good estate to them, whom he likeneth to abortives. Let this suffice concerning *abortives*, incapable of sinne or punishment; and *abortives*, whose estate of soul is dangerous, being measured by the rules of precepts. Which I say against Anabaptists, and the contemners or causeless delayers of that gracious Sacrament.

5 It is now supposed, and shall (if it please God) hereafter be demonstrated, *That humane souls are not traduced, nor carnally brought out of the flesh*: yet are they occasionally, (that I may touch at the manner) God having resolved and decreed, after generation and fit organization of the Embryo, to create and infuse a reasonable soul: which soul, because it is united to a masse corrupted, in such a manner as a spiritlesse masse may be corrupted, or rather to a masse inclining or inducing to corruption, in the very union it contracteth originall sinne. Hugo Etherianus thus determeeth on this point, * *When the soul languisheth, it is neither cast down by the will, nor by necessity, but onely by fellowship; if the soul were corrupted by the will, it should not be counted originall sinne, but actuall: if it should fall by necessitie, that vice were no further to be imputed.* Concerning the latter part, I answer, if in his *necessity* he imply coaction, he saith true: otherwise, by this concurrence of our condescending will in Adam, or by our own implicit will, we may draw on us a necessitie of after-sinning, which most justly may be imputed to us, and we may tie our selves with our own bonds. To the former part this may give satisfaction, That against the will of the soul, the soul it self can not be corrupted: for then the will should be forced, and so no will at all, but *Nolanta*, and not *Voluntas*. *It is not necessary*, saith Bellarmine, *that our soul must needs come from Adam, because we draw sinne from him: if but one part come from him it is enough.* For a father doth not *per se* produce originall sinne in the childe, but *per accidens*; namely, as by the act of generation it cometh to passe, that his sonne is a member of mankinde, which

* *Cum anima languere efficitur, non voluntate, non necessitate, sed fide societatis percellitur: si voluntate corrumpitur anima, non originale, sed actuale potiùs committit; & necessitate cadens, vitio illud vitium, Hugo Etherianus de Animæ regressu ab Iosiris cap. 4.*

was overtaken in Adams corruption; and that the propension unto evill of the earthly part traduced, meeting with a soul not much resisting, causeth this originall sinne to result thencefrom, and death by this originall sinne. So that no sooner is the soul united to its body, and the matter glewed to the form, but the infant deserveth to be, and is the childe of death, by reason of the primigenall corruption. If you enquire after what manner the body worketh the soul unto this evill; we may truly say, * *The body worketh not upon the soul by a naturall And immediate action.* You heard what Hugo Etherianus said, *It is stricken or cast down onely by fellowship.* He enlargeth himself in the same Chapter, thus, * *Imperfection, languishing, and corruption abide in the flesh before the soules conjunction; from which disease the soul is infected: as if a vessel be tainted with an ill odour, it infects therewith whatsoever liquour it receiveth.* Gerson thus, * *The soul by the conjunction with the body contracteth that infection; as when one falleth into the mire, he is besmeared and stained.* Felisius thus, * *A clean apple put in an unclean hand is soiled. Good wine poured into a fustie vessel contracts a strange taste, and loses its own naturall: so the soul loses its naturall vigour, when it is united in the flesh.* Another thus, *Anima cum labente simul labitur, & frustra nititur dum immittitur.* To the same effect another saith thus, *As the purest rain-water falling on dust, is turned with the dust into a lump of mire: so at the coadunation of the soul unto the earthly part, both spirit and flesh are plunged in the durt of corruption.* Augustine against Julian the Pelagian, 4. 15. preferreth the very Heathen before Julian; for he held, *That nothing was conveyed unto us from Adam*; and they held, * *That we were born to be punished for old crimes committed in a former life.* And, saith Augustine, *it is true which Aristotle relateth, That we are punished like to those who fell among the Hetrurian robbers,* * *Whose living bodies being coupled face to face with dead mens carcases, were so killed.* Of the Hetrurian Tyrant Mezentius Virgil, Æneid. 8. recordeth the like;

Mortua corporibus jungebat corpora vivis,
Componens manibúsque manus atque oribus ora,
(Tormenti genus) & sanie taboque fluentes,
Complexu in misero, longâ sic morte necabat.

But I return from this Digression. The Heathen say (as S. Augustine relateth) * *That our souls united to our bodies are like the living coupled with the dead.* They saw somewhat, saith he, and commendeth their wisedome in discerning the miseries of mankinde to be for somewhat before committed, & in acknowledging the power and justice of God, though without divine revelation they could not know, that it was Adams offence which brought such a wrack both on our souls and on our bodies.

What

* *Corpus non agit in animam actione physicâ & immediatâ.*

* *Vitium & languor & corruptio ante animæ conjunctionem in carne persistunt, ex qua tabe anima maculatur, sicut si testa odore malo imbuta sit, quemcunque liquorem susceperit, suâ corruptione inficit.*

* *Anima ex conjunctione ad corpus contrahit illud vitium, sicut quandoquis cadit in lutum, fœdatur & maculatur.* Gers. in Compend Theolog.

* *Pomum mundum in manu immunda positum fœdatur. Vinum bonum transfusum in vas acetosum, suum naturalem perdendo saporem contrahit alienum: sic anima, quando incipit esse in carne unita, suum naturalem amittit vigorem.*

* *Nos ob antiqua scelera suscepta in vita superiore, pœnarum luendarum causâ esse natos.*

* *Quorum corpora vivæ cum mortuis, adversa adversis accommodata, quàm aptissimè colligabantur & necabantur.*

* *Nostros animos cum corporibus copulatos, ut vivos cum mortuis esse conjunctos.*

What hath been hitherto related, ſeemeth too much to encline to the naturall, phyſicall, immediate working of the ſoul upon the body. Others are as faultie, who ſay, *The ſoul receiveth no annoyance from the body, but by way of* IMPEDITION *onely, where the ſpirituall faculties are hindered, and the Muſick ſpilt, by reaſon of the ununeeblenes of the organes.* But they wil not ſeem to heare, *That a ſpirituall ſubſtance can receive infection from a nature corporeall.* Both opinions may reſt contented in the middeſſe or mean, That as the body cannot go beyond the ſphere of its activitie, and work properly and phyſically upon the ſoul: ſo by the interpoſition, as it were, of a middle nature, the body not onely hindereth the faculties of the ſoul from working, but ſometimes worketh upon the ſoul. Thus the naturall, vitall, and animall ſpirits do binde and unite the ſoul to the body, that neither part can part from other, though it would. Thus bodily objects work on the minde, but it is by the mediation of the outward and inward ſenſes. Shall corporeall, outward, and remote objects, by degrees, draw the ſoul into ſinne, even in our perfect age, when our naturall reaſon is moſt vigorous; and may not the corrupted ſeed, having as great a propenſion to evill as Naphtha to take fire, at the conjunction infect the ſoul with a participation of uncleannes, though the operation be not phyſicall, or immediate? By Adams ſoul ſinning was Adams fleſh infected; may not our ſoul be infected as well by our fleſh? A ſpirituall ſubſtance can produce a bodily effect. Boëtius ſaith excellently, *Forms materiall came from forms immateriall: Our will was moved by our intellect, our appetite by our will, and a bodily change conformable to our appetite.* And may not a *bodily ſpecies* work by the ſame degrees, backward, on the ſoul it ſelf? The reaſon is alike in the contrarietie. Doth the corporeall fire of Hell torment and affect the incorporeall ſpirits of evil Angels, and ſhall it of wicked men, (as moſt certainly it doth and muſt, which ſhall be proved, God willing, otherwhere) and may not the matter make ſome impreſſion on the form, the body upon the ſoul, when there is ſuch a ſympathie in nature betwixt them? If the ſoul do no way ſuffer from the body, how doth it follow the temperature of the body? How doth madnes, fooliſhnes, anger, and love, with other affections, work upon the minde? Yea, how cometh it to paſſe, that not onely ſtrength and nimblenes of body, but even goodnes of wit is propagated, (if nature be ſtrong) and children reſemble their fathers both in manners and underſtanding? The fleſh it ſelf without the ſoul, if it be beaten, hurt, or cut, is no way ſenſible. Reunite the ſenſitive ſoul to the wronged body, the ſoul feeleth, and is much affected: nor is the grief in the inciſion onely, but in the ſoul. Yea, in apoplexies and deep ſleeps, caſt upon men by ſtupefactive ingredients and compounded by art, while

while the soul is in the body, wounds have been given unto the earthy part, and it never felt them: when those fits are vanished, the soul feels the pain of the discontinuity, and division of the flesh, as well as the body. Doctor* Rainolds thus, *God by nature hath ordered, that the soul naturally united to the body,* * *Should suffer with the body, and be grieved the body being afflicted, and rejoice it being refreshed, and be sorrowfull the body being killed; so that some way it suffers by reason of the body.* Permit me but the use of his modification, *some way*, and I dare say, The body drawes the soul *its way*, *some way* to sinne. Aquinas on Rom. 5. Lect. 3. *It should not seem, that sinne which is an accident of the soul, can be produced by the originall of the flesh. It is answered* (saith he) *with reason. Though the soul be not in the seed, yet there is in the seed a vertue disposing the body to receive the soul, which soul being poured or infused into the body, is after a sort conformable to the body, because every thing received is in the receiver according to the capacitie of the receiver.* To him let me adde, If a new created soul should be put into a body not descending from Adam, it should not have originall sinne; but meeting with a body disposed to corruption, after its kinde it yeeldeth, and contracteth originall sinne.

6. Yea, but the act of Adams sinne passed quickly away, and the guiltines was forgiven; how could it infect us? I answer, * *The person did first infect the nature, afterwards the nature did infect the person.* The speedy gliding act poisoned our nature; and we have not uncorrupted Adams nature, or any part of it; but his corrupt nature propagated corrupteth our persons. The forgivenes of that his guilt and sinne joyned with subsequent holines of life, is no priviledge of innocency to his posterity; who were not made of his perfect, but vitiated nature. Accordingly since that time, they who are cleansed with the laver of regeneration, sealed with the spirit, justifyed by faith, presented blamelesse to God by Christ, precious in the eyes of the Lord, just among men, elect, and pure; even such do beget children over whom this gangren of corruption creepeth, and the babes are infected with originall sinne. If it be objected, *If the root be holy, so are the branches*, Rom. 11. 16. therefore holy mens children are better in their generation, then wicked mens children: I answer, the fallacie is in the word *Holy*, which in the place to the Romanes signifieth not inward holines in the sight of God, but outward holines, whereby they might be distinguished from other prophane people. Thus the wicked Jews were as holy as the righteous Abraham, even the traytour Judas himself. If any further insist and alledge, *The children of a beleever are holy*, 1. Cor. 7. 14. It is also truly further answered, That the same word *Holy* is homonymous; not being all one with justified, regenerate, exempt or free

*Præfect. 5 1. *De Libris Apocryphis.*

*Compatiatur corpori, & affisto corpore vexetur, & recreato exhilaretur, & corpore occiso condoleseat; ut quodam modo ratione corporis patiatur.

*Persona primum infecit naturam, post natura infecit personam.

* Sanctus significat relationem, non qualitatem. Scharp. Curs. Theol. pag. 461.

* Sunt gignuntur ex electis semina electa, & ex eius semine non nisi electi, cui inter electos, non & electum plurimum distat. Aug. De Nuptiis & Concupiscentia l. 1. & 2. 34.

* Quid quæris istorum vitium, cum habeas operis originem? Non secundum Apostolum, Per unum hominem peccatum introivit. Aug. De Nuptiis & Concupisc. 2. 28.

before, to wit. That by creation it is infected, and so soon as it is infused, intaseth of corruption. But this seems strange, if not impossible. That the soul, so soon as it is tied to the body, should be caught like a bird with a lime-bush, and bound up in corruption as in a bundle. Let him that obiecteth, remember the Angels, higher of nature then men: Created they were in the truth, but *they did not abide in the truth*, John 8. 44. *God found no stedfastnes in the Angels*, Job 4. 18. Did not *Satan fall like lightning from heaven*? or rather according to the Greek, *Satan fell from heaven like lightning*, Luke 10. 18. and lightning is gone, ere we can say, it is come. *The Angels kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation*, Jude vers. 6. Do not some of the School say, *They fell the 1st. instant of their creation*? and Aquine and his fellows maintain, it was * *presently after the first instant*? So that what Seneca said of the burning of Lyons, *I am longer in telling thee, that it perished, then it was in perishing*, we may well apply to the evil Angels not standing, or beginning to fall. And (alas!) what a short time was there between Adams perfection, and imperfection? how suddenly did he conceive and bring forth corruption? So quickly doth the soul of a young childe sink under corruption, though it be not speedily discerned. The seed of a Snake, Toad, or Serpent, hath dangerous and desperate inclinations in it, though they break not forth long after. For as in the darkest day we can not difference, distinguish, or know the blindnes of a blinde mans eye, from the eye of him who is not blinde; but when the light cometh, it is easily discerned: so in infants, originall sinne appeareth not, but in processe of time, it groweth manifest. Humours putrifying and putrified are long in the body, ere they come to their height, and shew themselves outwardly: so is sinne in the soul of every childe, it lurketh in our nature, which was derived unto us from our Fore-fathers. Yet let me not be mistaken, as if I held, that we are answerable for the sinnes of our Fore-fathers, or that Adams future sinnes after his first sinne and fall were propagated, or the iniquities of any other our immediat, mediat, or remote progenitours shall lie heavy on us. For man begetteth man like to himself, as he is *Species hominis*, not as he is *Individuum*: and Accidents belonging to the individuall person of the Father passe not over to the childe, but those things that pertain to the sperificall nature. Therefore what belongeth to man, as he is *Individuum*, he doth not propagate. As for example. A Musician begetteth not a Musician, but a man, an Astrologer an earthly, a wiseman a fool, a Divine a carnall, a holy man an unclean person. Should we propagate as we are *Individua*, we should also convey, and communicate to our posteritie our knowledge, our arts, our sciences, and our Fathers holy inclinations, and mortified dispositions. For good is more diffusive

* *Statim post primum instans.*
* *Diutiùs illum tibi periisse, quàm periit, narro.* Sen. Epist. 91.

diffusive and spreading of it self, then evil can be; and God extendeth Mercy further then he doth his Justice, Exod. 20. 6. Which vertuous good since we do not derive unto our posteritie, neither do we or shall we partake of our predecessours sinnes, or of any one sinne, except of the onely first sinne of our first predecessour.

7. There was not given either to Adam, or to the sonnes of Adam, any one precept which belonged to all mankinde: I mean such a precept by the breach of which we might have fallen in their fall, or in Adams fall, without our own actuall consent, save onely *one*, of which I spake so much before; neither do the acts of any fathers necessarily binde all his descendents. Jonadab the sonne of Rechab commanded his children, saying, *Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye nor your sonnes for ever: neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any*, Jerem. 35. 6, 7. They are commended because they *performed the commandment of their father*, vers. 16. and are blessed for obeying and keeping all his precepts, vers. 18. but therefore (in my opinion) more commended and more blessed, because the performance was more of voluntary devotion, then of binding necessitie, or a meer imperious charge: for his precepts could not lay so great a tie upon all his descendents: but certainly the obedience was of free condescent, not coactive command, unlesse we say by immediate divine revelation he was commanded to put that yoke upon his posteritie for ever.

It is a true maxime in School-divinitie, *Meerly personals are not transmitted*. Of this sort is holinesse and sinne; and therefore not traducted unto others. After Zacharie was dumbe, Luk. 1. 24. he begat John Baptist, *a crier, the voice of one crying*, Mark 1. 3. And John 9. 10. the blinde man had parents which could see. Halting Jacob, Genes. 32. 32. begat the lion Judah: the lusty lovely Jonathan, the lame Mephibosheth. But there are others which may be called *mixt-personals*, and these are oftentimes hereditarily derived. Thus through the noisome qualitie of the seed, one leper begetteth an other; and a father subject to the stone or gout, transmitteth those diseases full often to his children: and it hath been the wish of some Physicians, and (if I be not much mistaken) I have read it as the practise of some countries or commonwealths, that they that are naturally subject to contagious diseases, or evils hereditary, as Apoplexies, Epilepsies, Consumptions or the like, are forbidden to sow their seed in wholsome grounds, yet are forbidden marriage, to avoid future danger. But these diseases never labor to infect the soul with sinne. Aquinas or Rom. 5. Lect. 3. goeth one step further. *The sinnes of the fathers are punished on the children in the defects of the soul, Anger, and mad men beget children and*

[a] *Puré personalia non propagantur.*

mad men. Yet in the end he closeth thus, *It is manifest, that though the first sinne of the first Adam be traducted to posterity by the originall; yet Adams other sinnes, or the sinnes of other men are not derived to their children: because by the onely first sinne* subtractum est bonum naturæ, *that naturall good was taken away, which should have been traducted* per originem naturæ, *by the originall of nature. By other sinnes the good of personall grace is withdrawn, which passeth not over to posteritie. Hence it is, that though Adams sinne was blotted out by his repentance, yet his repentance could not wipe out the sinne of his posteritie: because his repentance was by an act personall, which could not extend it self beyond his person.* So farre Aquinas. But let discourse give way to Scripture. Jer. 31. 29, 30. *They shall say no more, The fathers have eaten a sowre grape, and the childrens teeth are set on edge: but every one shall die for his own iniquitie, every man that eateth the sowre grape, his teeth shall be set on edge.* They had occasion to use this proverb, in reference to Adam who ate one sowre grape, in whom we sinned and are punished. But *as I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel,* Ezek. 18. 3. *Behold, all soules are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the sonne is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die,* vers. 4. And when God said, Exod. 20. 5. *I visit the sinnes of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me:* I answer, First, the place speaketh not of the sinnes of children, (for the fathers personall iniquitie maketh not the sonne inique or wicked) it is onely spoken of punishments. Secondly, even punishment eternall doth not reach from the father to the sonne, unlesse the sonne communicate with the sinne of the father: for *if a wicked father beget a sonne that seeth all his fathers sinnes, which he hath done, and considereth, and doth not such like, he shall not die for the iniquitie of his father, he shall surely live,* Ezek. 18. 14, 17. In this sort you may object, A man shall not be punished at all for the sinnes of his forefathers, but for his own sinnes onely. I answer, He may be punished temporally, but not eternally: for in temporall chastisements, as there be many causes producing one effect, so many sinnes, even of diverse men, may be corrected by one punishment; and the father is often more grievously punished in his sonne, then in himself.

Now having spoken what I thought convenient, concerning the propagation of originall corruption unto all the posteritie of Adam, I am in the last place to shew the just consequent, That as he did die for that his sinne, so we his offspring for having that sinne should die, and in regard of this sinne, *It is appointed for men to die,* and to undergo that punishment. For originall sinne is in one regard a fault of transgression, and the same originall sinne, in a different respect is also a punishment. [b] As

[b] Aug. de baptismo parvulorum.

every

every man was in Adam, and his corrupted nature was propagated to us, it is a sinne, as it proceedeth from it, culpable in us, and without reflecting on the common nature, it is a punishment. It is so a sinne, or such a sinne, that it is also a punishment: and we have spoken of it as a sinne, let us now descend to handle it as it is a punishment.

1. A review of the last point. Zanchius not against it. Bucer and Martyr are but faint, and rather negative then positive. There [illegible] the same to be the question.

MOst Prepotent, Eternall, and onely Wise God, I a poore dejected sinner, with an humble and contrite soul, devoutly beg pardon at thy Mercie-seat, confessing from the bottome of my heart, my manifold, personall, and actuall sinnes, from all which if thy Grace had prevented me, yet my offence in Adam and with him had justly condemned me: But I meekly beseech thy Divine Majestie, that I may be one of those many, to whom the bloud of thy deare Sonne shall do more good, then the fault of Adam did hurt. Grant this, I beseech Thee, for the All-sufficient merit of thy onely Sonne, our onely deare and gracious redeemer, Jesus Christ. Amen.

8. The personall holinesse of the parents never conveyed grace or salvation to the sonne.

9. God never punished eternally the sinne of the [illegible] upon their children, if the children were holy.

10. No personall sinnes can be communicated. The point [illegible] as large against the error of Zanchius and Martyr.

11. The [illegible] opinion. The new writers more to be [illegible] against Bucer and Martyr.

[illegible] proceeded, and (as I [illegible] the contradiction of [illegible] by the discourse of a loving learned friend, that divorce late Writers were otherwise minded in the point last handled in the former chapter; whereupon I betook my self to review it. Zanchius in [illegible] upon the second chapter of the Epist. to Philem. [illegible] this objection against one part of his definition of original sinne: Some say, that if

H

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

1. *A review of the last point. Zanchius not against it. Bucer and Martyr are but faint, and rather negative then positive.*

2. *Bucer and Martyr make the state of the question to be solible, not fixt and stated. Their objections answered. The place of Exodus 20.5. examined.*

3. *S. Augustine appealed unto, and defended.*

4. *God justly may, and doth punish with any temporall punishment, any children like or unlike unto their parents, for their parents personall sinnes.*

5. *God doth, and may justly punish some children eternally, and all temporally for originall sinne, whether they be like their parents in actuall aversion, yea or no.*

6. *God justly punisheth, even eternally, wicked children, if they resemble wicked parents.*

7. *God oftentimes punisheth one sinne with another.*

8. *The personall holinesse of the parent, never conveyed grace or salvation to the sonne.*

9. *God never punished eternally the reall iniquities of the fathers upon their children, if the children were holy.*

10. *No personall sinnes can be communicated. The point handled at large against the errour of Bucer and Martyr.*

11. *The arg[illegible] opinion. The new Writers not to be o[illegible] of it is against Bucer and Martyr.*

I. HE proceeded, and (as I thought) without the contradiction of any, I found by the discourse of a loving learned friend, that diverse late Writers were otherwise minded in the point last handled in the former chapter; whereupon I betook my self to review it. Zanchius *in locis communib. Theolog.* upon the second chapter of the Ephes. *loc. prim.* toward the end, bringeth this objection against one part of his definition of originall sinne: *Some say, that if there fore Adams sinne was transferred to posteritie, because we were*

in

in his loines by the same reason; the other sinnes of children and other parents should be likewise traducted, which to affirm, and such like not to yeeld to, since of evill parents oftentimes good children are born. He endeavoureth, first, to evade the force of the first similitude, that so proper and peculiar to Adam, is common to humane nature: his debite sinnes, and Gods visiting divinely perfect. When answer is excellently and he confuteth it at large. Then commeth he to a second answer, which is not his own, but onely barely related, without his approving or open disproving of it. *Besides, many learned men deny, that it is absurd to say, that the sinnes of the next parents are communicated to the children, so that sometimes born like their parents, vicious and perverse sonnes of vicious and perverse parents; which they confirm by experience, by examples of Scripture, by Exod. 20. 5. And Augustine truely in Enchirid. cap. 48. saith it is probable for that place of Exodus. For saith he, if the sonne shall not beare the iniquitie of the father, but the soul that sinneth shall die, and yet God visite the sinnes of the fathers upon the children, it seemeth to follow, that the sinnes of the parents passe over to the sonnes, and the sinnes follow the sinnes of the parents, that those sinnes may be justly punished in them, which are not so proper to the parents, as common both to parents and children.* And for this opinion he citeth Bucer and Martyr. All this cloud (for it is but a cloud, and an empty one also) will quickly be dispersed. First, in the generall replication observe, that Zanchius himself never specifieth this, as his own judgement. Secondly, note how cautelously Bucer and Martyr carry it on the negative, *Many learned men deny that it is absurd to say, &c.* Themselves see no convincing demonstration, but are content if their opinion be not *absurd*. Errours there are that are absurd; if this be not absurd, all is well. Thirdly, of those *many* are but two named by him, Bucer and Martyr: learned men indeed, yet not more learned then many that herein differed from them. Fourthly, many words are *homonymous*, and they themselves slide back from them, by varying the state of the question, as will appeare by and by. Lastly, let the grounds by me set down in the last chapter be well weighed, and the truth will appeare on my side.

2. Now let me descend to the matter of their objections. *The sinnes of the next parents are communicated to the children*, say they. Here they should have been punctuall, and I desire to be satisfied what they mean. Whether the sinnes of the father and mother be transfused into all the sonnes and daughters? and into all of them alike, or not alike? And if the father be vertuous, and the mother wicked, or contrariwise, the mother vertuous and the father wicked, what is communicated to the childe? Secondly, what sinnes be communicated? all, or some? Whether Atheisme and prophanenesse of thoughes, or

[a] *Deinde, negant multi viri docti absurdum esse, si dicatur, peccata proximorum parentum communicari liberis, ita ut similes parentibus nostantur filii, vitiisq; vitiosi.*

[b] *Peccata proximorum parentum communicantur liberis.*

only such sinnes as the heart is much implopted in performance of? Thirdly, whether the sinnes of grand-fathers and grand-mothers be derivable? and if so, whether if there be a good grand-father and a good grand-mother, and a good father, the children shall inherit no goodnesse, but the sinne of their wicked mother onely? Or if two of them be good, and two bad; the males good, and the females bad; or contrariwise, what sinne shall be communicated to their children? Fourthly, whether the sinnes of the great-grand-father, and of his progenitours, our more remote progenitours, be derived? and where beginneth the derivation of these sinnes? and why from such determinate persons and generations, rather then from others? Or whether they must reach up from all the descendants of Adam, to his actuall and personall sinnes? Fifthly, whether such actuall and personall sinnes as are supposed not to our parents and all our forefathers, be derived unto us? or onely such as they were not repentant of? or both sorts of them? Sixthly, let noveltie know, *Peccata proximorum communicantur liberis*, in stead of *Propagantur ad liberos*, is an unknown phrase to antiquitie: and it is better to speak plainly according to the dayes of the Fathers, then in terms covert and dubious; and then in defence of such riddles, to say no more then the old Tenet, [a] *Deceit lieth hidden in universals.*

The second branch of pendulous new-fangledneſſe is this: [b] *The sinnes of the next parents are communicated to the children, so that children are born like unto their parents, vicious of vicious.* First, it is *petitio principii*, that the vicious childe being like to his vicious father, proceedeth from the fathers multiplied transgressions: for if he be like to his father in sinne, he is also, in that regard, as like and more like to many other actuall sinners, from whom there could proceed no generative communication of iniquitie. Secondly, what is naturall, is ordinary, is ofteneſt, is alwayes so, without some notable hinderance: but the childrens being like the parents are not thus; therefore the communication is not naturall. Thirdly, suppose a wicked sonne curseth his father, or wisheth him dead, or mocks at him; he also begetteth a sonne, which sonne doth the like to him, as he did to his father: shall we say (if the generation had descended, after many, from Cham, who laughs or mockt at his father, Gen. 9. 22.) that this sinne of Cham was traduced, derived, or did passe over to this last mocker? or shall we say it was derived unto him from the personall sinne of his immediate last father? No; we must rather say, it was derived unto him from his last parents, in and by that originall sinne onely, which was traduced. That this may the better be manifested, consider these points. First, that Adams first sinne, though it were one onely, yet more sinnes went involved in it: Augustine saith

[a] *In universalibus latet dolus.*

[b] *Peccata proximorum parentum communicantur liberis, ità ut similes parentibus nascantur liberi, vitiosi vitiosis.*

faith, *Adam was formed to be the head over covered into the world, and possessour to all men, whose sinnes must be understood as one sinne be divided into all its parts or members.* And he found there many branches of Adams sinne, and denieth not but more may be found in him, as ill, in the rest committed. Secondly, he maketh that one to be transfused upon all mankinde. Thirdly, none in the world were ever more eager then some of the Lutherans, to aggravate the grievousnesse of original sinne. Illyricus is almost frantick on the point. Zanchius and others are truely peremptory, that all faculties of body and soul are infected. Let me adde, There never was sinne, nor can be, but the seed of it was couched in the sinne originall. So that every man hath just cause to blesse God, for withholding him from every sinne, great or small, since every man hath a naturall inclination to every sinne, even unto that sinne which (by Gods grace) he most detesteth. Therefore if wicked children be like their parents, it proceedeth not from their parents personall transgressions, but from that one infectious root of the first sinne of Adam, strengthened by connivence, ill breeding, or customs, or ill company. Fourthly, an holy man and woman who never mocked their parents, have a sonne who mocks at them; shall his mocking proceed from his parents, or his parents parents, who never personally did the like? or shall Chams sinne be communicated to him? Then, why do they instance in this sinne of the next parents? If they mean, it is communicated in originall sinne, they mean what I say, and contrary to their own words. Lastly, sinne originall is alike in all and every one, and alike remitted in Baptisme of infants; yea, though the parents should be infidels, and send their childe for fashion-sake, or by way of jesting to be baptized: if the Church know not so much, and if the childe be offered unto God by the well-meaning devotion and faith of Priest and people present, and be baptized with true matter and form, it receiveth spirituall regeneration, as I read long since, if my memory fail me not, in S. Augustine. The personall offences or holinesse of parents are not communicated to their children. Again, they object, that they confirm this by experience. These are words of winde, and nothing else. That wicked ones beget often children like to them, who denieth? That their children have their fathers personall sinnes transmitted, is the begging of the question. Yea, but they prove it by examples of Scripture. How? or where? By the place, Exod. 20. 5. *I visit the sinnes of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.* I answer, He doth not say, *I transmit*, or *communicate sinnes*, which is our onely question. Even Illyricus himself among all his explications of visiting sinnes, hath none for communicating, propagating, transmitting, trans-

ferre. and particularly of this place of Exodus, he ſaith, *viſiting the iniquitie of the fathers, that is, punishing the posteritie for the enormious sinnes of their ancestours.* Yet if *to viſit* had been to *propagate actuall sinnes*, it had been his beſt proof, That the ſubſtance of the ſoul is corrupt by originall ſinne, and hath in it the image of Satan. They alledge S. Auguſt. who ſaith it is probable by that place of Exodus. The words of S. Auguſt. are theſe in the place by them cited; [g] *It is not improbably ſaid, that children are liable to the ſinnes of their parents, not onely of their firſt parents, but alſo thoſe of whom they are immediately born.* And at the end of that chapter, [h] *In that one ſinne, which paſſed over to all men, and is ſo great, that in it humane nature is not changed and turned to a neceſſitie of death, more ſinnes are found, unto other of parents, which albeit they change not our nature, yet by their guilt they binde children;* where he makes an apparent diſtinction, between that one ſinne which changed our nature and was propagated unto us, and thoſe other perſonall ſinnes of our fathers, which change not our nature, but binde us over unto puniſhment: for that is his meaning of *reum obligant*. He doth no where ſay, ſuch ſinnes are communicated unto us, or that they binde us with the guilt of offence, but he is to be underſtood of the guilt of puniſhment. And ſo Bellarmine expounds him, *De amiſſion. grat. & ſtatu peccati* 4. 18. Indeed he doth it ſomewhat timerouſly towards the beginning of the chapter with a [i] *perchance*. But he is more poſitive and fully aſſertive at the latter end of the ſame chapter, that Auguſtine and the Fathers ſpake onely of the communication of puniſhment, which Bellarmine proveth, becauſe they inſtance in Exod. 20. 5. which hath apparent reference to puniſhment: and indeed ſo the word *viſit* is moſt-wiſe uſed in Scripture, *viz.* for to *puniſh*: and ſometimes in love, mercy, grace, and goodneſſe, to *viſit*: but never is uſed for the communicating, or propagating, trajecting, or tranſmitting of ſinnes. Nay, [k] Gregorie goeth further, as he is cited by Bellarmine, teaching that the place of Exodus is to be underſtood of thoſe children, who imitate the ſinnes of their parents: and *ſo the Chaldee Paraphraſe hath it*, ſaith Vatablus. Laſtly, to cleare this truth, that Auguſtine in that place meant onely the binding over unto puniſhment, ſee his own words, Chap. 47. (which I marvel that Bellarmine paſſeth over) [l] *But touching the ſinnes of other parents, by which every one from Adam himſelf to his own father ſucceeds his anceſtours, it may well be diſputed, Whether he that is born be involved in the evil acts and multiplied original ſinnes of all; ſo that how much the later any man is born, ſo much the worſe: Or whether God doth therefore threaten the poſterity unto the third and fourth generation for their parents ſinnes, becauſe, through his mercifull moderation, he extends his wrath no further for the faults of progenitours;*

[g] Fortaſſe, non de contagione culpæ, ſed de communicatione pœnæ locuti ſunt Auguſtinus —

[h] Greg. Mor. 15. 22.

[i] Sed de peccatis aliorum parentum, quibus ab ipſo Adam uſq; ad patrem ſuum progeneratoribus ſuis quiſque ſuccedit, non immeritò diſceptari poteſt, utrùm omnibus malis aliis & multiplicatis deliſtis originalibus, qui neſcitur implicetur, an tantò pejùs, quantò poſteriùs quiſque naſcatur: An propterea Deus in tertiam & quartam generationem de peccatis eorum poſteris comminetur, quia iram ſuam, quantum ad progenitorum ſuorum culpas, non extendit ulteriùs, moderatione miſerationis ſuæ; nè illi quibus regenerationis gratia non confertur, nimiâ ſarcinâ in ipſa ſua æterna damnatione premerentur, ſi cogerentur ab initio generis humani omnia præcedentium parentum ſuorum originaliter peccata contrahere, & pœnas prò iis debitas pendere. An aliud aliquid, de re tanta, in Scripturis ſanctis diligentiùs perſcrutatis & tractatis, valeat vel non valeat reperiri, temerè non audeo affirmare.

towns, lest they to whom the grace of regeneration is not given, should be pressed with too great a burden in their eternall damnation, if they were forced to contract the original sinnes of all their forefathers from the beginning of mankinde, and to undergo the punishments due to them. Or whether some thing else concerning so weighty a matter may be found in the holy Scriptures diligently searched and perused, I dare not rashly affirm. You have the whole chapter word for word out of S. Augustine. In which observe, First, the adversative particle *Sed*, distinguishing the question from the other: which also Erasmus in the margin hath thus distinguished, comprising the meaning of the 46 chapter in these words, [a] *That the children are bound by the sinnes of their parents*: and of the 47 chapter, [b] *We ought not rashly to determine how farre the sinnes of ancestors be extended*. Secondly, in the former chapter he said exactly, [c] *It is not improbably said, that infants are bound by the sinnes of their parents*. He changeth the phrase in the latter, [d] *It may well be disputed*, and, *I dare not rashly affirm*. Thirdly, his phrases in the former chapter are not so distinct as in the latter, where he mencioneth both the *contracting* of sinnes, and *undergoing punishment* for them. Fourthly, weigh this strong inconvenience which he toucheth at. That the latter born in time, is still the worse in nature, worse then any that went before, as followeth necessarily, if the sinnes of our forefathers are communicated to us. Fifthly, he seemeth to conclude the unreasonablenesse, That they who were never regenerated, should be overburdened with eternall damnation, if they should be compelled from the beginning of mankinde to contract the sinnes of all their progenitours, and be punished for them. And therefore he questioneth, Whether it reacheth onely to the third and fourth generation. I would also question, Whether (if the threat reach onely to the third and fourth generation) upon supposall, that from Adam all the predecessours of a man were wicked till the fourth generation, that man shall have none of those sinnes imputed to him, before his progenitours in a fourth ascent. Or if so, as their progenitours were all good from Adam till the foure last generations, and from it all and every of his parents, in a lineall descent, were good for naught, till we come to himself, who is good: Whether he shall have communicated to him the sinnes of these foure last progenitours, and no goodnesse for a thousand generations of holy and repentant forefathers (himself also being a holy man) since God sheweth mercy unto thousands that love him, that is, more mercy to more good men, then severitie, which extendeth, even towards his haters, but to the third and fourth generation, which number is scarce of thousands.

The last objection from the place of Exodus, is this, *It followeth not to follow, that God doth punish the sinnes of parents passe unto their*

[a] *Quosque maneant filii peccata parentum, non tenere dubium est.*

[b] *Non temerè definiendum, quousque peccatis parentum obligari filios.*

[c] *Non improbabiliter dictum, parentum peccatis parvulos obligari.*

[d] *Non immeritò disceptari potest, &c. Non audeo temerè affirmare.*

[e] *Cuiquid videtur, Deum permittere ut peccata parentum in filios transeant.*

their children, and the sonnes imitate the sinnes of their fathers, that God may justly punish sinnes, which are not so proper to the parent, as to the parent and childe. I answer, He doth well to mince it with *It seems to follow*. But, *Quædam videntur, & non sunt*, Some things seem to be, and are not. Buter and Martyr do float too much in generalities; they neither mention what sinnes, all, or some; neither what parents, good, bad, or all; nor what they mean by *passing*, when they say, *The sinnes of parents passe unto the children*. There are also nets and gins in these their words, *The spot and, as it were, contagion of sinne overspreadeth the fathers body, and by his blood and seed redoundeth upon the children*. Before they said *sinne*, now *the spot of sinne*, though there be a great difference between them two! for the sinne is past before the spot cometh, and the latter is the effect of the former. Again, because it is easie to prove, that *the sinne of the father redoundeth not on the children*, it is added, *the spot and, as it were, contagion*. Moreover, how aptly do they bring the place of Exodus, to prove *the sinnes of the next parents to be communicated* (if by them they understand onely the immediate father and mother) when in that place there is expresse mention of the third and fourth generation? If they stretch the words [*of the next parents*] to the third and fourth generation onely, why not to the fifth, sixth, and so upward? Sixteen generations since Christs time, are the next parents, if you compare them to the thirty nine generations, which in the law of Nature and of Moses preceded Christ. Lastly, note their wilde inference, God permits the fathers sinne to passe unto the childe, and the childe to imitate the father *that he may punish*: as if God could not justly punish the sinnes of the fathers in the children, unlesse they be like them in personall transgressions: as if the communication of original sinne onely, were not cause enough to punish children for the sinnes of their parents: as if the evil of sinne were ordained to justifie the evil of punishment. Away then with this fishing in troubled waters, this delighting in amphibolous terms. Which censure that I may the rather justifie, I will endeavour to explain all things necessary to the knowledge of this point, to salve all doubts, to unfold all intricacies in these seven propositions.

4. God justly may, and doth punish with any temporall punishment, any children *like* or *unlike* to their parents, for their fathers personall sinnes. *Horat. Epod.*

Innocentis pascit in extremum Remus
Sacer nepotibus cinis.

And *Carmin. 3. Ode*

Delicta majorum immeritus lues Romane.

For the children are a part of the fathers, and in the childes punishment the father himself is punished. For as a cleare receiveth

† *Peccata parentum in filios transeunt.*

‡ *Peccatorum labes & eius contagium redundat in patris corpus, & per ejus sanguinem & semen in filios.*

§ *Macula patris non redundat in filios.*

* *Labes & eius contagium.*

verth (under God) life and the things of this life, by the father: so it is no injustice, if he lose the same for him. The widow of Zarephath her sonne, was (in her apprehension) dead for her sinne, 1. King. 17. 18. So 2. Sam. 12. 15. God stroke the childe that Urians wife bare to David, and it was sick and died. Both father and childe endured a punishment of seven dayes: the father in sorrow fasting a fast, lying on the earth, in a holy sordiditie weeping and praying: the childe by sickneſſe tormenting him to death. Ahabs children were punished for his offence; 1. King. 21. 21. and among the rest Jehoram his sonne: who although he wrought evil in the sight of the Lord, yet was not so bad as his father or mother, 2. Kings 3. 2. The passage is very observable, Jer. 16. 3, 4. *For thus saith the Lord concerning the sonnes and daughters that are born in this place, and concerning their mothers and fathers, They shall die of grievous deaths: Both the great and small shall die*, verſ. 6. The punishment of Gehazi his posterity is more exemplarie: for though they sinned not, nor could sinne the sinne of Gehazi; yet the leprosie of Naaman did cleave unto him, for that his personall simonie, and unto his seed for ever, 2. Kings 5. 27. The case of Jobs children surpasseth this: for they were not stricken with death for their own sinnes, or the sinnes of their father Job, so much as for the triall of his patience, and for the experimentall confutation of Satan; yet was it not unjust that they should lose their lives for their fathers good, which they had by him; since he also suffered in their sufferings, and might easily see Gods especiall hand against himself: For the greatest winde in the world naturally cannot smite the foure corners of an house; and if it should, yet one corner would uphold the other: but this whirlwinde did so, *and the house fell*, Job 1. 19. 1. Sam. 15. 6. the Kenites are spared, because *they shewed kindneſſe to the children of Israel when they came out of Egypt*: but because Amalek had *fought with Israel*, Exod. 17. 8. though they were presently punished, by being vanquished in battell; yet God said, verſ. 14. *Write this for a memoriall in a book, — I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek under heaven. — And the Lord did swear he would have warre with Amalek from generation to generation*, Exod. 7. 16. And above foure generations after, about 400 yeares, Saul destroyed them. A *Quere* indeed may be made, Whether God can justly punish the fathers for the childrens actuall delinquencies. And this resolution is calle, That he may do it, if the father hath doted on the children, & not duely corrected them: (for so did God to * Eli) or if wicked children do tenderly love their parents (which though it be not usuall, yet it hath been so;) and in this case the punishment of the father is indeed a punishment also of the childe. But if an holy father do his duty, and hate his sonnes courſes, and thereupon

* 1. Sam. 2. 25.

the

the childe loveth not his father, if God can punish the father with temporall punishments for the notorious faults of his sonne, yet he will not punish him eternally. Nay, I will go yet further, and truely avouch, that the sinnes of predecessours which are not of consanguinitie with us, but are fathers onely by our imitation, fully may be punished on their children. First, the word *father* is taken two wayes in Scripture; for either there are fathers by imitation, or fathers by nature, from whose loyns we lineally descend. The Jews, though they came not of Cain (whose posterity ended at the flood) yet may be said to be his *sonnes* by imitation; yea they are called *the sonnes of Satan*, Joh. 8.44. because they followed his steps, and *did the work of their father*, vers. 41. which is one degree more remote. Those, who thus take a pattern for themselves out of example of wicked ancestours, God justly punisheth. Satan having been *a murderer from the beginning*, John 8.44. Cain being (as it were) the head of murderers among men, and the Jews treading in their steps to an inch, they may justly be cast into the same fire *prepared for the devil and his angels*, Matth. 25.41. And the Apostle S. Jude justly pronounceth, vers. 11. *Wo to them that have gone in the way of Cain.* Yea, our blessed Saviour himself foretelleth the Jews, that for their bloudy proceedings, *Upon them shall come all the righteous blond shed upon the earth, from the blond of the righteous Abel, unto the blond of Zacharias, whom* they *slew*, &c. Mat. 23.35. Where, first, the distinct deaths of severall martyrs or just ones (as the Syriack hath it) is called αἷμα δίκαιον, *one just blond*: secondly, they are not said in the preterperfect tense, *to have been shed*, but in the present tense, αἷμα ἐκχυνόμενον, *which is shed*, or *is now a shedding*, as Jerusalem is called, vers. 37. ἡ φονεύουσα, *quæ occidisti, occidis, occisura es*, as Erasmus well expounds it. All these circumstances concurre, to make (as it were) one continued act of murder, from the beginning of the world till the destruction of Jerusalem, repayed with one and the same punishment upon the father and all the sonnes of imitation. Now as the punishment of the fathers by imitation may in an extended sense be communicated to posterity: so their sinnes cannot be said to be communicated. For how can the sinne of Cain be communicated unto him, who last of all killed his brother? and unto the Jews, who descended not from him, but from the younger brother? Or can we think that God will inflict damnation upon men for others personall transgressions? Temporall chastisements he may justly inflict for the ungracious perpetrations of parents. x *There is no vengeance taken on thee, Israel, wherein there is not an ounce of the iniquitie of the calf*, saith Rabbi Moses Ben Nachman, whom they call *Ramban*, or *Gerundensis*. See an excel-

x *Non est tibi, Israel, ultio, in qua non sit uncia de iniquitate vituli.*

excellent place for both points together; Jerem. 32. 18, 19. And eternall torment can he rightly adjudge the soules and bodies of men unto for originall sinne: which is our second proposition.

5. God may, and justly doth punish some children eternally, and all temporally for originall sinne, whether they be like their parents in actuall aversion and back-sliding, yea or no. For the most righteous sonnes of Adam endure pain, labour, sickness, death, which are the orts and effects of the primogeneall offence: and the death both of soul and body was inflicted in *Morte moriemini*: and this shall hereafter be fully proved.

6. God justly inflicteth eternall punishment on wicked children, if they resemble their wicked parents. 1 *The imitating of wicked men, makes a man to be punished not onely for his own sinnes, but for theirs also whom he imitates.* This is a truth so apparent, that it needeth no further proof.

1. *Malorum imitatio facit, ut non solùm sua, sed etiam eorum quos imitati sunt, merita sortiantur.* August. in priori Enarr. Psal. 108.

7. God oftentimes punisheth one sinne with an other. And in my opinion, this manner of punishing, if it continue all a mans life, is worse then the torment of hell-fire, which were better to be speedily undergone, then to be deferred with the increase of sinne. Psal. 69. 27. *Adde punishment of iniquitie*, or *Adde iniquitie unto their iniquitie.* Thus *God gave the Gentiles over to a reprobate minde*, Rom. 1. 28: and then such offenders do but *treasure up wrath against the day of wrath*, Rom. 2. 5. But this happeneth not for the foregoing offences of our progenitours, but for our own transgressions.

8. The personall holinesse of the parent never conveied grace or salvation to the sonne. *Abraham the father of the faithfull* prayed for his sonne, Gen. 17. 18. *Oh that Ismael might live in thy sight!* yet was he a cast-away. Temporall blessings indeed he had for Abrahams sake, vers. 20. Isaac had an Esau, David an Absalom, and often the like.

9. God never punished eternally the reall iniquities of fathers upon their children, if the children were holy. Let an instance be given to the contrarie. Indeed it is said, Psal. 109. 14. *Let the iniquitie of his fathers be remembred with the Lord, and let not the sinne of his mother be done away.* But he speaketh, first, of a very wicked man, equalling (if not exceeding) his parents in sinne. And the New Testament applieth it to Judas, Act. 1. 20. to Judas, the monster of men. Secondly, the remembrance mentioned, hath reference rather to penalties consequent, then onely to sinnes precedent; 2 *It is remembred in regard of the punishment, because the children were pricked for the iniquitie of their fathers who slew Christ*, saith Cajetan on the place. And this is not our question. Thirdly, why may there not be *a change of number*, as Vatablus stileth it? And though the

2 *Memoratur quatenus ad pœnam, quoniam puniti sunt filii pro iniquitate patrum, qui occiderunt Christum.*

Interlineare bible readeth it *patrum eorum*, and Vatablus so expounds it, but reads it *patrum ejus*: why may it not be expounded *patris ejus*, being accordant to that following, *peccatum matris ejus*? and whether it be *patrum eorum*, or *patrum ejus*, or *patris ejus*, I see not but originall sinne may be meant in both places, as being expressed onely in the singular, rather then the many actuall transgressions: especially, since our singular originall sinne came to him by many fathers: and it was not the intent of Gods Spirit in this Psalme, to extenuate the sinnes of the wicked ones forefathers, and to plaister this over with the title of one single iniquitie. Indeed Theodoret on the place saith thus, [a] *The fathers vertue hath often profited the transgressing children; as Abrahams faith did the Jews, and Davids pietie Solomon.* So Cesar at his pardoning of those in Marseil, and in Athens, who took part with Pompey in the civill warres, said, *They were excused for their ancestours sake:* as contrarily, [b] *The wickednesse of parents increaseth the punishment of like children*, saith Theodoret. I answer, That all this speaketh of temporal chastisements, none of eternall horrour, infligible upon good children for the sinnes of their parents. When God saith, *I will visit the sinnes of the parents*, if it implyed the visiting them with like sinnes, as it doth not; yet it is of them that hated him also, and by their personall hating him deserved to have one sinne punished with an other: for the hatred of the sonnes is meant, as annexed to the sinnes of the fathers. This any one may see that will read Ezekiel 18. 14. *Lo, if a wicked man beget a sonne that doth not like his father: he shall not die for the iniquitie of his father; he shall surely live*, vers. 17. *God hath no pleasure that the wicked should die*, vers. 23. And hath he delight that the righteous shall perish eternally for his wicked ancestours? The drift of the whole chapter is against it, and proveth his wayes to be equall: because a wicked man repenting shall not die for his own transgressions, vers. 25. &c. And shall a righteous man die, or be condemned (for he meaneth the death of the soul) for the offences of others? *Who ever perished being innocent? Even as I have seen, they that plow iniquitie, and sow wickednesse, reap the same*, Job 4. 7, 8. and *God rewardeth every man according*, not to the works of his forefathers, but according *to his own works*, Rom. 2. 6. Mat. 16. 27. which seemeth to be taken from the Psalmograph, who ascribeth to the Lord, not injustice, not severitie, but grace and mercie in his judicature; *Unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy: for thou rewardest every man according to his work*, Psal. 62. 12. And *Every one shall give account of himself*, Rom. 14. 12. *Every one shall receive the things done in his bodie, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil*, 2. Cor. 5. 10. If this be not enough, more may be added with an easie hand, to the strengthening of this fifth Proposition,

now

[a] *Patrum virtus sæpe filiis peccantibus profuit, ut fidei Abrahæ Judæis, & Davidicæ pietati Salomoni.*

[b] *Prioritas parentum filiis similibus pœnas alungat.*

now chiefly questioned, *God never damned a good childe for the fathers personall wickednesse*. I now come to the seventh Proposition.

10. *No personall sinnes can be communicated*. Indeed, they who maintain the traduction of souls may, if that be granted, better defend the propagation of actuall iniquities. But that opinion being false, ridiculous, exploded, and hereticall, (of which otherwhere in this Tractate,) the superstructive is founded on slippery ice: and these terms, *To propagate, communicate, derive, transmit*, and *transfuse sinnes personall*, are meerly amphibologicall and dubious phrases. If they mean as the words do signifie, let them say, that the matter of sinne actuall is transfused, or the form, or both. The matter is the action, the form is the obliquitie thereof: both these do vanish. Doth the guilt of punishment passe over? [a] *Guilt is a band joyning punishment & sin as a thing coming between them*. And this band is rather in God, then in man, to tie or untie at his pleasure. [b] *An act that is past already, is said to remain in regard of the guilt; not that the guilt is any thing, but because a man is denominated guiltie from such an act. The guilt of sinne is not any thing, since it is neither a substance nor an accident, but onely remains in the secret Lawes of God and minades of Angels*, as Holcot, *De Imputab. pec.* truely gathereth from S. Augustine. The guilt is not the personall sinne it self, but the effect thereof, and our question is not now of the descent of punishments. Doth the guilt of sinne take hold of the childe? they cannot say so, unlesse here also they confound the effect with the cause: and this is but *Petitio principii* in other terms. Again, how heterodoxall is it, to say, *A man begetteth a sonne guiltie of all his actuall iniquities*? For then, though the father may be saved by his after-repentance, yet the sonne who knoweth not perchance, nor ever heard inckling of his fathers horrid and secret sinnes, (according to their position) may be damned for them. Do they mean, the stain and spot is communicated? I answer, The stain and spot is not the actuall sinne, but the fruit of it inherent in the soul of the offender, and not transmissible by the bodie, and is onely metaphorically termed the stain, having no positive realitie transmissible. Zanchius himself relates their opinion thus, [c] *That the spot and, as it were, contagion of the sinnes which any parent committeth, doth redound by Gods just judgement, upon his bodie and blood, and is further transfused by his blood and seed into the sonnes whom he begets of that seed thus viciously affected*. I answer, That [*ista Deiudicia*] is brought in *tanquam Deus aliquis e machina*, to make things vait & improbable seem likely & passable: but the vain impertinencie of these words is easily observable by any, who knoweth that no manner of Gods judgements are any way unjust. Secondly, are not sinnes of omission personall sinnes? and are they communicated to the

[a] *Reatus est vinculum inter pœnam & peccatum, quasi medium interjectum.*

[b] *Actus qui jam transiit, dicitur manere quoad reatum; non quia reatus sit aliquid, sed quia à tali actu denominatur quis reus. Reatus peccati non est aliqua res, cùm non sit substantia vel accidens, sed solùm maneat in occultis legibus Dei & mentibus Angelorum.*

[c] *Peccatorum suo aliquis patrem committit, labem, & ipsa contagionem justo Dei judicio redundare in ejus corpus & sanguinem, & per ejus partes sanguinem & semen in filios, quos ex illo semine sibi vitiosè affecto gignit, transfundi.*

the bodie? Thirdly, what say you to pride of heart, and secret Atheisme? Is the proud mans, and Atheists bodie and bloud infected with these prodigies? Again, If such people be wholly forgiven, and their sinnes by repentance blotted out; are they now in their bodie, seed, and bloud, which are wiped out of their soul? and suppose he beget a sonne between the Atheisme and repentance, shall his childe be damned, while the repentant Atheist is saved? should not he rather communicate his later repentance, then his former Atheisme?

But let us weigh the words a little neerer, *The blot and, as it were, contagion of sinnes which the father commits, redounds upon his bodie and bloud, and by his blood and seed to the sonnes.* What bloud is corrupted? all, or onely that which was made seed? and of seed, what seed? all seed, or onely that which is fruitfull? Suppose a father begets a sonne with the seed which was in his bodie yer his sinne was committed; how doth his sinne viciate his bloud, or his bloud the preformed seed? If seed and bloud be properly vicious; then any ejaculation of seed, or letting of bloud, should emptie people of their sinnes or staines in them inherent; and sinne should no longer be a privation, but a positive thing. Moreover, when they say, *That by the fathers bloud and seed, the blot and, as it were, contagion is transfused into the sonnes*, they speak without reason or sense. For the blot and, as it were, contagion are transfused (if transfused at all) into the wombe of their mother, which hath a preexistence, and not into the children themselves, who have no preexistence. The vessell is before any thing can be poured into it; how then can sinne be voted by the fathers bloud & seed into the childe that had no being? The last passage is this, *The childrens bodies are first infected by these staines or bloudy sinnes, & their soules after defiled by their bodies.* If by the word *infected* they mean, really, truly, properly, and actually infected, I remit them to the place where I have proved, that the Embryo without a reasonable soul is not, cannot be sinfull: If they would be expounded of a prontitude to evil, or inclinations tending that way, when the soul is united; they have made much ado about nothing: a meer logomachy, retaining the old sense, and using novelties of terms. Again, if I should yeeld, That the seed of one man is prouer to one vice then an other, according to the vivid strength and able disposition of the parents, as (they say) bastards are more healthie, and more tenacious then other people, as retaining part of that fruitfull vigour in which they were begotten; yet is originall sinne the same in every one, alike in all parts and every way; and the meanest to the parents in wickednes is most remotely ascribed to the seed, but properly to originall sinne, as to the inward cause; and to the parents ill breeding them, or to bad company, or custome, or to the remembrance

[*Peccatorum, quæ aliquis parens committit, labes, & ejus contagium, redundat in ejus corpus & sanguinem, & per ejus sanguinem & semen in filios.*

brance of their parents ſinne (which is a powerfull preſident in corrupt nature) as to the outward cauſe. For a wicked childe is as like a thouſand other wicked men, if not more like in behaviour then to his father, yet this proceedeth not from their ſeed, but from originall ſinne. But to the more diſtinct handling of this point (this ſeventh and laſt Propoſition) Firſt, I will prove, That the perſonall ſinnes of all our forefathers, are not derived to us. Secondly, That not the ſinnes from the third and fourth generation are propagated. Thirdly, That the perſonall ſinnes of our immediate parents are not transfuſed; And ſo it will ariſe of it ſelf, that no perſonall ſinnes are communicated. In the ſecond place I ſhall bring to light the authorities on our ſide. But before I begin either, let me briefly remove an objection. Bucer and Martyr teach (ſaith Zanchius) that by this doctrine the transfuſion of originall ſinne is more confirmed. I anſwer, That Gods truth hath no need of mans lie to uphold it. Cicero ſaid well, [s] *Perſpicuitie is leſſened by argumentation.* For what is more beleeved, more known to Chriſtians, then that originall ſinne is traduced? Weak arguments do often prejudice a good cauſe; and while Bucer and Martyr would ſeem to confirm that truth, which neither Jew, Turk, nor Chriſtian doubt of, let them take heed, leſt when they ſay actuall ſinnes are traduced, they give occaſion to the world to think, that humane ſouls are not created, but traducted, & ſo by conſequent, bring in the mortalitie of the ſoul. For it hath been confidently averred by learned men, That if the ſouls be traducted, they are mortall. But of this hereafter.

[s] *Perſpicuitas argumentatione elevatur.*

Concerning the firſt branch, theſe arguments confirm it. If the actuall ſinnes of all our forefathers be communicated to their poſteritie; then they that are the more ancient are ſtill the better; and the laſt people of this world ſhall abſolutely, by nature, be worſt. But it is not ſo: for Pagans and Infidels now ſhould be many thouſand times worſe then the firſt infidels: which is not ſo, as is ſeen by experience. Secondly, then we might truely ſay, *O happy Cain!* happier by nature then Abel the righteous: (ſince Adam and Eve did manifoldly ſinne between Cains and Abels generations) yea, happier then Abraham, and the Patriarchs, juſt Job, and the Prophets, the Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts: ſince thou haſt fewer ſinnes to anſwer for then any in the world. Happier is all the drowned world in this regard, then the dayes ſince Chriſt. But to ſay ſo, is new Divinity. Therefore all ſinnes of actually tranſgreſſing parents are not communicated. Secondly, God dealeth not ſo rigourouſly with mankinde, as he did with the devils: *Verily he took not on him the nature of Angels, but took on him the ſeed of Abraham*, Heb. 2. 16. whereby he magnifieth Gods mercy to man, above that to the rebellious ſpirits: but he ſhould or did deal

worse with mankinde, at least with the damned, then with them, if all the personall sinnes of our progenitours be communicated to all us. For each of them bare onely but their own sinnes, and none did beare one anothers sinne further then they actually partaked with it. And this can not be otherwise: for both their sinne was pride, and their nature uncapable of propagation, or communication of sinne, unlesse it be by reall and present consenting or partaking. Lastly, *They all fell together the second or third instant of their creation*, saith the School. Suddenly the devil of *Lucifer* became *Golubar*; of *Oriens*, *Occidens*; of *Hesperus*, *Vesper*. *He abode not in the truth*, Joh. 8. 44. *Satan fell from heaven like lightning*: where lightning is not said to fall from heaven; but he *saw Satan fall as lightning*, *ita ut quasi videbam non moram*, Luk. 10. 18. *Satan falling as suddenly from heaven, as lightning doth* from the clouds on us; which is gone ere we can say it is come. Yea, not Satan alone, but the rest of the Angels *kept not their first estate*, Jude vers. 6. which Job thus varieth, *God found no stedfastnesse in his Angels*, Job 4. 18. Seneca might well say of materials, Epist. 91. *No great thing but had some space of time in its ruine and destruction*, yet in spirituals he was blinde or mistaken. For there was no succession of times in the sinnes of any sinning Angels: but as at once they were punished, and their place found no more in heaven; so at once almost they sinned: nor did succeeding Angels beare their predecessours sinnes or punishments: Therefore mankinde shall not do so neither.

[h] *Nulla res magna non aliquod habuit ruinæ suæ spatium.*

Thirdly, S. Augustine in his Enchiridion, chap. 47. toucheth at this argument as unreasonable, if they who have not the grace of regeneration, should contract the sinnes and beare the punishment of all their progenitours, from the beginning of the world; saying, [i] *They should be overburdened in their eternall damnation.* But God punisheth rather *citra*, then *ultra vindictam*, *rather lesse, then more then we deserve*; and his mercie is above all his works. And as his wrath is to three or foure descents, so his mercie extendeth unto more, unto thousands; but his mercie is not shewed unto more, if all our forefathers sinnes lie upon us, unlesse we can finde that there is former that more then *all*. Therefore mankinde committeth not the sinnes, nor suffereth the eternall punishments due to the sinnes of all our parents.

[i] *Premerentur nimiâ sarcinâ in æterna sua damnatione.*

Fourthly, The justice of God will not permit the same sinne a million of times among many millions of persons to be punished: but thus it must be, if Seth answer for Adam and Eves actuall sinnes, and all Seths posteritie to this day for every one of their predecessours sinnes. Therefore *all sinnes of progenitours are not communicated.*

This first branch receiveth strength and confirmation from the

the second, which is this, *Perhaps all sinnes of our progenitours are not derived or communicated unto us from the third or fourth generation, much lesse do they reach up to our first parents.* Indeed the great S. Augustine in his Ench. chap. 47. makes this *Quære, Whether God threatens posterities with the sinnes of their fathers from the third and fourth generation, or threatens the father with punishing their posterity, because his wrath extendeth no further, lest posterity should be overburdened. Or whether some other thing concerning this businesse, may, or may not be found by diligent search of Scriptures, I dare not rashly affirm.* But I hope, without rashnesse, I may be bold to affirm, that God threatneth not to punish sinne with sinne in that place, but with other punishment. Secondly, nor menaceth eternall punishments for the onely sinnes of parents preceding: but onely the communion is of temporall punishments, if they be unlike their wicked parents; & eternall, if they be like in sinne unto them. This being the apparent meaning of the place, and the word *visito* being ever taken to be synonymous with *punio*, or *castigo*, whensoever it is contraopposed to *facere misericordiam* (as here it is) whereupon Gods judgement is called *the visitation of souls*, Wisd. 3. 13. Psal. 89. 32. *I will visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquitie with stripes*, or scourges. Let me in the third place affirm, That though God punish posterity temporally, for the onely sinnes of parents; and eternally, if wicked children resemble their parents; yet it followeth not, that sinnes are communicated to the third and fourth generation. For the temporall punishment may be justly inflicted on good children of wicked parents: and eternall is as justly inflicted on the evil offspring of an evil man; yet, rather as himself is evil, then as his parents were evil. Again, both the threat and the mercie are onely conditionall. Lastly, if God should flatt the punishment alwayes at the end of the third or fourth generation, which he needeth not, and doth not; yet it followeth not that sinnes are limited at the third or fourth generation, or that that is the prefixed period of time, to which the communication of sinnes may be extended. But as in the words [*unto thousands*] there is the uncertain for the certain, the indefinite for the definite, (for it is not expressed how many thousands, either of men, or yeares, or generations,) so in the words [*the third and fourth generation*] there is the certain for the uncertain, the definite for the indefinite. And as God doth not tie himself to shew mercie unto the end of numbers of hundreds & thousands, so is he not restrained from punishing beyond foure generations. But therefore the third and fourth generation is named, rather then any other, because many a man now liveth to see his third or fourth generation flourish or decay. And therefore in our Liturgie, in the solemnization of marriage, the Priest

prayeth that the couple united may see their childrens children unto the third and fourth generations. And indeed, Job lived, after his great afflictions, to see *his sonnes, and his sonnes sonnes, even foure generations*, Job 42. 16. Again, Gregor. Moral. 15. 22. interprets this of originall sinne: and not onely the Vulgar, but the Hebrew hath it *iniquitatem patrum*, in the singular; and the third and fourth generation, (if so understood) *hath reference to the ages of the world*, saith [t] Augustine: from whom Procopius Gazeus little differeth upon the second commandment, thus; *Our Saviour said somewhere, This generation shall not passe, till all these things be fulfilled*; (the place is Mat. 24. 34. accordingly Mat. 23. 36. *all these things shall come upon this generation*) *and truely he spake of the end*. So he makes the fourth generation from Christs time to the end of the World; the third from the Law to Christ; the second from Abraham to the Law (he should have said from the Floud to Abraham; for was not Noah and all his, till Abraham, part of humane generations?) the first from Adam to the Floud. And the opposite member, [*shewing mercie unto thousands*] may be understood of millions of actuall offences forgiven. So much by the way for that exposition.

[t] Aug. Cont. Adamantum cap. 7.

I return to the second branch, *Sinnes are not communicated to the third and fourth generation*. For why not aswell to the fifth and sixth generations, and so downwards to the worlds end? Let some reason be shewed, why the force of communication of sinnes should rest there. The place of Exodus intimateth not the communication of sinnes, but the punishments; and the punishments so farre, because many live so farre, and few farther: and the exemplarie sinnes of fathers may be seen and remembred and followed by their fourth generation, and not further: and fathers dote not so much on their children, as grand-fathers and great-grand-fathers, nor cocker them up so much in evil. It is a senseless consequence, That man communicateth sinnes actuall, to the third and fourth generation, because God punisheth the sinnes of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation, unlesse they can prove, *Whatsoever God punisheth, man doth communicate unto man*; which is impossible; for God sometimes punisheth such sinnes of the childe as the father never had, and of such a childe as never had childe after, to whom he might communicate them.

The third and last branch of the seventh and last Proposition is this, *That the immediate parents personall transgressions are not communicated to us*. They may by way of punishment, by way of offence or sinne they cannot. No one sinne actuall is traduced, propagated, transfused, communicated. If any one actuall sinne be derived, why not more? why not all, and every one?

Why should the communication of sinnes rest in the father and mother, *grand-all*, when many children are liker their grand-fathers both in shape and feature, and in minde, and in vices, then to their father and mother, who were void of such personall misgressions?

Thirdly, it is a true and old distinction, *That originall sinne infecteth our whole nature, and actuall sinnes infect the person.* But this distinction is taken away and removed, if actuall sinnes do infect our nature, and are propagated by the seed, which is proper to sinne originall. It is not called originall sinne, for being the root of all sinne, (for Satan sinned first) but as it is in our nature originally. In this point Whitaker agreeth with Stapleton, *De originali peccato*, l. 4. And there Stapleton worthily observes, that [1] *originall sinne seeth a fractuall difference, whereas actuall is personall, signifying that the fault of sinne is in the nature, not the person.* As whenwe mention *actuall* sinnes, we make an opposition to sinnes *habituall*, or to sinnes of *omission*, or to sinne *originall*. If personall sinnes do passe over into the children, then Adams sinne did so to his children. But not so. For it is but one single singular sinne which we found in Adam.

If Adams personall vices were propagated to Cain, were all, or part propagated? if part, what were those? and why those above others? if all, what did Adam transfuse to Abel, Seth &c. Did he propagate onely those sinnes, which were committed between the generation of one and the other. And what sinnes did Seth propagate to his posteritie? Are personall sinnes propagated alike to all the children. How is it else of one mans children, I have known one naturally exceeding angry, another naturally stupide. Again, if a naturall fool begetteth one wise, what sinnes doth he communicate: or on the contrary; a Machivel begetteth a naturall fool; shall the fool be damned for his politick fathers malengin?

If actuall sinne be traduced, then, is it in the seed ere the soule come? in the seed in the fathers bodie? in the seed at the emission, at the reception, and retention? Then millions of seeds spent in lawfull matrimonie, when women do not conceive, or what they have conceived, not having no soule, shall have sinne actuall: and if they have sinne, they must come to account. But such fruitlesse disbursements do not appeare in judgement. Again, if personall sinnes be propagated, are they remitted in Baptisme, or not? if remitted, how are they so like their parents afterwards? How can the seed, which is not so much as an humane body actually, but onely potentially, be actually sinfull? If personall sinne be communicated from the next parents, how is it that experience teacheth us, that very godly mens children are given to filthy courses, as their parents in their youth, middle age, and old age have detested?

[1] *Originale peccatum differentiam facti significat, quæ opponitur personali, designans causam peccati naturalem esse, non personam.*

It

it cannot come by communication of actuall sinnes. You will say, it doth arise from sinne original. So we say, and so do all sinnes whatsoever arise from that corrupted fountain, that ever-bubbling wel-spring of evil, and not from a phantasticall communication of actuall transgressions. If a meer Pagan and heathen, an idolatrous worshipper of devils, beget two twinnes; shall they be alike wicked? We have heard and known the contrary. Gods discriminating saving grace doth not difference them, as you may say it doth in Christians. Lot committed actuall sinne, and knew it not; was that sinne propagated to his sonnes? That actuall sinne should be in the seed, which is but a superfluity of nature, is very strange. If Job had presently, after that God had commended him to Satan, saying, *There is none like him in the earth, a perfect and upright man, one that feareth God, and eschweth evil*, Job 1.8. betook himself to the act of generation: or David at those times, when he was a man according to Gods own heart: what personall iniquities had they propagated? Isa.56.5. unto holy eunuchs God *will give a place better, and name better than of sonnes and daughters*: yet, by this opinion, they of all other are most miserable; for they receive all the actuall sinnes of their fathers, and cannot waft over either them or their own sinnes into their children by their seed, (for they have none) but all must rest in their souls, in their bodies, in their bloud, and upon themselves onely.

If God should miraculously create a man and woman, not of the seed of Adam, and they blaspheme God, and beget children, shall they transfuse actuall sinne, which have not original sinne? or shall their children blaspheme naturally? Or, if they be innocent themselves from that great offence, shall they be damned for their parents blasphemy?

If personall sinne be propagated, then the habits or acts. But neither. Not acts; for they are transient, and glide away. Not habits; for then, first, why should not habits of knowledge, or goodnesse, or the like be transfused, as well as of evil? especially the habits of knowledge of evil? Secondly, then a childe is not onely originally sinfull, by froward inclinations, but habitually, by multiplied actions. Thirdly, habits belong to the person *individuall*, not to him as he is a *species* of mankinde; but propagation is according to the *kinde* or *species*, not according to the *individuals*.

If ye object, Ezek.16.3. God chargeth them of Jerusalem thus, *Thy father was an Amorite, thy mother an Hittite*; whereby he upbraideth them with their fathers sinnes. I answer, These words are not spoken of naturall descent, but of parents and children by imitation. For the Amorites and Hittites were idolaters; and the Israelites who succeeded them in

in their inheritance; its children do fathers, inherited also their sinnes, as appeareth in the whole chapter, especially vers. 44. *Behold, every one that useth proverbs, shall use this proverb against thee, saying, As is the mother, so is her daughter. Thou art thy mothers daughter, that loatheth her husband and her children; and thou art the sister of thy sisters, which loathed their husbands and their children: your mother was an Hittite, and your father an Amorite. And thine elder sister is Samaria, she and her daughters that dwell at thy left hand: and thy younger sister that dwelleth at thy right hand, is Sodom and her daughters.* The whole kindred is by imitation, not by nature. But our question is of true consanguinitie, and reall generation. Further, if the immediate parents of those of Jerusalem were idolaters, like to Amorites and Hittites; yet their sinnes are related, as arguments the rather to deterre their children from the like, and to keep them from the temporall punishments, which might justly be inflicted on them: but no way do the words intimate, that they should be damned for their predecessours offences, unlesse they continued in the same.

A second objection may be this: Gen. 9. 22, 25. *Cham the father of Canaan saw the nakednesse of Noah, and Noah cursed his grand-childe Canaan.* I answer, That Cham or Ham had divers other children, to wit, Cush, Mizraim, and Phut, Gen. 10. 6. and Noah cursed none of Chams children save Canaan onely. Upon which I conclude one of these two things; either that the curse extended onely to things of this life, or that Canaan was partaker of his fathers sinne. For otherwise, the rest of Canaans brethren must have been equally involved both in his guilt and in his punishment. Concerning the first, the words are Gen. 9. 25. *Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.* The other two might perchance, at distinct times, rule the one over the other, but Canaan shall be a servant, both to Shem, v. 26. and to Japheth, v. 27. To be *a servant of servants*, indeed was the curse of Canaan; and it was really accomplished, when the Canaanites were made tributary and overcome, and the Gibeonites (a part of them) were made vassals to the meanest Israelites, which were the offspring of Shem. Witty Epigrams and Pasquils have been made both against the citie of Rome and its Popes.

Aversum coluit quia Roma infamis Amorem;
Nomen ei averso nomine fecit Amor.

Which name of Rome, if it had been first given, when not onely the Apostle S. Paul taxed them, Rom. 1. 26. &c. but even their fellow-heathen Petronius Arbiter, *in Satyr.* might have had some colour for that denomination: But since it

was

was called Rome, when the ſinnes of that kinde were not hatcht or heard of, I ſay the inverted and averted name was rather witty and poſthumous, then ſound. Likewiſe they have this crochet againſt the Papal title of *Servus Servorum*, *Roma, tibi quondam fuerant Domini Dominorum. Servorum ſervi nunc tibi ſunt Domini.*

And Calvin derideth that Gregorian title. But the Abbot Rupertus well doth difference, that the Pope is not called abſolutely *Servus ſervorum*, *The ſervant of ſervants*, but *Servus ſervorum Dei*, *The ſervant of the ſervants of God*. to which I adde, that he is not ſaid to be *Servus ſervorum fratribus ſuis*, *A ſervant of ſervants unto his brethren*, which was the exact curſe of Canaan; but that he makes himſelf to be called *Servus ſervorum filiis ſuis in Chriſto*, *A ſervant of ſervants unto his ſonnes in Chriſt*; from whom he imagined he took his name of *Pater* and *Papa*. The ſecond branch of my anſwer is, that Canaan was partaker of his fathers ſinne. That it might be ſo, is demonſtrable. For though Canaan was not born while Noah was in the ark, *wherein few*, *that is*, *eight ſouls*, *were ſaved by water*, 1.Pet.3.20. And thoſe eight ſouls were Noah and his wife, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and their three wives, Geneſ.7.13. yet Canaan was born unto Ham not long after the floud, Geneſ.10.1, and 6, verſes. The Rabbins ſay, Canaan was ten yeares of age, and firſt ſaw his grandfathers nakednesſe, and in deriſion ſhewed it to his father; whereupon the father was curſed in that ſonne more then others. But that the innocent ſonne ſhould be curſed eternally for the fathers offence, was never intended.

A third objection may be this: Joh. 9. 2. the Diſciples asked Chriſt, *Who did ſinne*, *this blinde man*, *or his parents*, *that he was born blinde?* From whence is inferred, that the Apoſtles beleeved, that the ſinne of parents is prejudiciall to the childe. I anſwer, The Apoſtles interrogation was grounded on knowledge, yet perhaps mixt with ſome ignorance. They truely did know, both that bodily puniſhments are ſent of God upon men for their offences, and that a childe might juſtly be puniſhed corporally for the parents iniquitie. But their ignorance is ſeen in this, that they thought no puniſhment was inflicted, but for ſome ſingular ſingled noted offence. But for whoſe offence, or what offence, there is the doubt which Chriſt thus untieth; *Neither this man ſinned*, *nor his parents*; (where he meaneth not that they had no particular ſinne, but not ſuch ſinne or ſinnes as for which this man was made blinde) *but that the works of God ſhould be made manifeſt in him*. Secondly, this inſtance is ſo farre from proving the ſinnes of the fathers to be derived to their ſonnes, that it excuſeth both parents and children

children from such and such sinnes. Thirdly, it hath appeared referr these to corporall punishments, which neither the Apostles nor I do deny, but they may justly be inflicted on the bodies or goods of children for their parents transgressions.

11. It followeth in my method, that I shew the authorities on our side. Bellarmine, *De Amissione Grat. & Stat. peccati* 4. 18. proveth at large, [t] *That all the sinnes of parents do not passe unto their posteritie by generation, but onely the first sinne of the first man.* Trelcatius and Willet crosse him not in this point. Scharpius pag. 487. *in Cursu Theologico* upon that point of Bellarmine maketh this *Quære*, [u] *Whether the sinnes of the next parents originally passe unto their posteritie?* and he answereth, *That Augustine moved the matter, yet determined it not: but we* (saith he) *agree with Aquinas, that it is impossible so to be.* And he alledgeth divers sound reasons for that purpose. Augustine himself indeed somewhere is somewhat doubtfull: and though he saith against Julian 6. 8. That Fundanus a Rhetorician of Carthage, [x] *being by an accident all but blinde of one eye, begat a sonne likewise blinde of one eye:* (where he seemeth to patronize the transfusion of personalls) yet the case is above ordinarie; as experience sheweth, and much may be ascribed to the imagination of the mother, rather then to the imperfect generation of the father. Though Augustine also *in Enchirid.* be somewhat cautelous and timerous, yet otherwhere (as I have proved before) he is confident, that we shall stand forth to judgement for one onely sinne of Adam, our originall sinne: which truth he confirmeth in one particular, thus, against Julian the Pelagian 6. 12. [y] *Therefore neither can Cain himself, though he knew his father Adam, be said to have sinned because his father sinned.* And more fully, *De peccat. Meritis & Remiss.* 1. 13. [z] *We have not derived from Adam (in whom we all sinned) all our sinnes, but onely originall.* Thus much be said to prove the divine S. Augustine to be of our side.

Onely Vorstius, of all the canvaſers of Bellarmine that I have met with, differeth from him and us, and maketh a double propagation, Generall, and Speciall: and saith, *If Bellarmines drift be against the generall propagation, it is false, because nature teacheth, and experience witnesseth, that ordinarily worse children are begotten of worse men. If he speak of the speciall traduction, our men easily assent unto him,* saith Vorstius. In reply on Vorstius. First, who ever before him talked of a double propagation? Not Scriptures, nor Fathers, nor Councels. Secondly, is this generall propagation done at the same time that the speciall is accomplished? Is this generall propagation better or worse then originall sinne? Is this generall propagation of all sinnes, and of all parents up to Adam, and of sinnes repented of, and of sinnes of omission, and of transient sinnes, or of such as Atheisme in the

[t] *Non transire ad posteros per generationem omnia peccata parentum, sed primum tantùm primi hominis lapsum.*

[u] *An peccata proximorum parentum originaliter in posteros transeant?*

[x] *Cùm accidenti vitio luscus esset, luscum filium procreavit.*

[y] *Propter hoc itaque, id est, quoniam peccavit Adam, nec ipse Cain peccâsse dicendus est, qui eundem patrem suum noverat.*

[z] *Ab Adam, in quo omnes peccavimus, non omnia nostra peccata, sed tantùm originale trahximus.*

[a] *Corruptionis ex corruptionibus ordinariâ generatione.*

soul, which hath small, or no participation with the bodie? Let him define or describe this minimum of generall propagation contra-opposed to the propagation of sinne originall. But, saith he, *Nature and experience say, Worse children are begotten of worse men.* I answer, I never knew any worse, then some children of some good men. Secondly, he puts *non causam pro causa*, ascribing the wickednesse of children to the propagation of actuall sinne of their immediate parents, when he may better impute it to their hearing or beholding of their parents wickednesse, or to ill breeding and ill customs. Thirdly, the vices of the immediate parents, and of the remoter, yea of the remotest, even from Adam, yea all the sinnes that ever were committed, yea which yet never were committed, but shall be or may be hereafter, differing either in kinde or number from all sinnes precedent, all have been, are, shall be (in regard of the beginning, roor, and fountain) in originall sinne. Fourthly, none ever that handled this controversie (as Augustine, or the School) did ever take actuall sinnes for inclinations to sinne. Fifthly, in Vorstius his distinction there is a fallacie, viz. *Petitio principii*, while he, without good proof, taketh that for granted which is the onely thing denied, namely, *That there is an other propagation, besides the propagation of sinne originall.* Sixthly, how inconsequentiall is this? *Wicked men have ordinarily wicked children; Therefore personall sinnes are propagated.* But indeed we denie the antecedent, and say, The sonnes of the wicked are as righteous, by naturall generation, as the sonnes of the righteous. If Vorstius reply, that every age groweth worse and worse, and

Et paremus pejor avis tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos
Progeniem vitiosiorem.

And again,

Aurea prima sata est aetas, aurea quae
——subiitque argentea proles,
Auro deterior, fulvo pretiosior aere:
Tertia post illam successit aenea proles,
——Ile duro est ultima ferro.

The answer is expedite, These are but poeticall fictions, scholies of those who knew no propagation of originall sinne, and ascribed this growing worse and worse to the depravation of manners then present in use, and to evill customes, rather then to the propagation of personall iniquities:

Labimur omnes, sed nostris animus mutat.

Much there is to the like purpose in heathen authors. Lastly, Vorstius himself, after his scolding to finde a knot in a bulrush, after his needfull opposition in this point, concludeth thus, *Haec tenus sint, quae pauli momenti sunt; Let this passe, because it is of small moment.* So this, even in his judgement, this controversie

troversie is small; and indeed I think it not worth the name of a controversie. Let me once more repeat that all

When I had come thus farre, labouring to prove that *no actus all or personall sinnes are propagated*, & casually again conferred with that learned loving friend of mine, who formerly brought to my hand the opinions of the new Writers, and upon some discourse, he setled on this exposition, which otherwise he gave over as indefensible, That they do mean by *actuall sinnes*, that *inclinations unto sinne are communicated*. I answered, That I used to gather mens meanings by their words, and that neither their words, nor the words of Zanchius the relatour, do incline to these inclinations. Again, never did any authour of any time before expound *personalia* and *actualia peccata* (for of these must the question be necessarily understood) by the *inclinations unto sinne*. Moreover, if by *peccata* they did mean the *pronenesse unto sinne*, to avoid doubtfulnesse, they should, and as readily and easily they could (if they would) have written *peccatorum inclinationes*, as *peccata* in generall, or might have signified in some other words, and in some other passages, that they had meant so. This I know, They talk of *peccata, peccata proximorum parentum, of labe peccatorum, & eorum contagium*; they have words ænoi, doubtfull and obscure enough, which I dare say themselves understood not when they writ, viz. *peccatorum labes, & eorum contagium*: yet make they no mention of *inclinations*. But I would further know, whether their inclinations are derived unto their children, and punished in them, which rest onely as inclinations, and never come into act: Or such inclinations as begin to come into act, but are resisted and overcome by Gods grace. Or onely such inclinations as breed actuall and personall iniquitie. If thus, then the inclinations are not punished, but the actuall aversions. Or, are no inclinations derived from grand-father, &c. I, but since originall sinne is alike in all, and some are more like to parents, whence doth this likenesse to them proceed more then to others? I answer, A drunkards childe is as like in that sinne to all other drunkards, as to his father.

Object.

But why hath a drunken father more commonly a drunken sonne, then a sober man? Firstly, that is not yet proved. Secondly, parents sinnes seen or heard of, easily invite the children to do the same. Thirdly, too many parents bring up their children to do as themselves do. Fourthly, if a most drunken sonne hath most sober parents, then it comes from sinne originall. Why not so also from drunken parents? If inclination of drunkennesse be more in the seed of drunken men then of sober, then the children of drunkards should naturally be more drunk and deeper drunk, then any other drunkards whose parents were temperate. But that is not so, at least not

so naturally, because not always, no, nor perchance commonly. Let me once more repeat, That all possible inclinations unto sinne are inveloped and involved in originall sinne, which they either knew not, or considered not. Lastly, when I had taken these pains to frame this chapter in defence of a point, which I never held to be questioned, it grieved me to heare my ingenious friend so much to defend the new Writers, and to dance after the new pipe. Candid and favourable expositions I shall love while I live, and both use towards others, and desire to be used towards me; but violent, forced, farre-fetched interpretations (as this hath been) I can no way allow. For since reformation hath been so sharp-sighted, as to finde fault in all things, to esteem the Schoolmen as dunses, (though they are thought dunses that so censure them) to account the Fathers as silly old men, or as children, (though they are but babes that admire them not) to disregard Provinciall Councels, yea Generall Councels, as the acts of weak and sinfull men (though they are the chiefest, the highest earthly-living-breathing Judges of Scriptures controversed;) which cavils against former times I have heard belched forth by the brain-sick zealous ignorants of our times: since we have hissed out the Papists, and think they speak against their own consciences, when they maintain the infallibilitie and inerrabilitie of the Pope: May not Bucer and Martyr erre? Must all new opinions needs be true, and defended with might and main, with wrested part-taking, over-charitable defenses, rather then a small errour shall be acknowledged? If such milde dealing had been used against times precedent, we could not have found (as some now have done) about two thousand errours of the Papists. But thus much (if not too much) shall suffice concerning these men and this matter, with this cloze, That Zanchius himself, in the place above cited, saith thus against that new-fangled opinion, [c] *For no other sinne was transfused to posteritie, then that which also was Adams: for it was disobedience with a privation of originall justice and corruption of the whole nature. Besides, we are sentenced to death for no other sinne then for that for which Adam also was: for death was the wages of the same sinne. Now it was said to him,* THOU SHALT DIE THE DEATH, *for disobedience, &c.*

Now let them say, (if they can) that Adam was sentenced to death for any sinne of predecessour or successour, or any other sinne of himself, but one onely. I have maintained and do resolve, *Death was inflicted for his first sinne onely.* Therefore by Zanchius his true Divinitie, against Bucer and Martyr, and their peremptorie defenders, Not all, not many sinnes, of all, of many, of any, of our predecessours; but the first sinne

[c] *Neque enim aliud peccatum in posteros transfusum est, quam quod ipsius quoque fuit Adami: fuit enim inobedientia cum privatione justitiæ originalis, & totius naturæ corruptione. Deinde etiam, non propter aliud peccatum nos sumus adjudicati morti, quam propter illud propter quod & Adamus: Ejusdem enim peccati stipendium fuit mors. Illi autem fuit dictum,* Morte Morieris, *propter inobedientiam, &c.*

sinne onely of Adam, is, transfused, or posteritie not to be guiltie or condemnable, for any other preceding actuall sinne or sinnes of others whosoever.

CHAP. VIII.

O Father of consolation, O God of mercies, who knowest that every one of us have sinnes personall more then enow to condemne us; lay not, I beseech thee, the sinnes of our fathers, or fore-fathers, or our own (if it be thy holy will) to our charge, to punish us in this life present, or our originall sinne, in and by Adam, or our own actuall misdeeds, to trouble our consciences by despair, or to damne us in the world to come; but have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, according to thy great mercy in Christ Jesus, our alone Lord and Saviour. Amen.

CHAP. VIII.

1. *Original sinne came not by the Law of Moses, but was before it in the World.*

2. *God hath good reason and justice to punish us for our original sinne in Adam. Gods actions defended by the like actions of men.*

3. *Husbands represent their wives. The men of Israel represented the women. Concerning the first-born of men and beasts. The primogeniture and redemption of the first-born.*

4. *The whole bodie is punished for the murder committed by one hand. Corporations represent whole cities and towns, and Parliament the bodie of the Realm. Their acts binde the whole Kingdome. Battelling champions and duellists ingage posteritie.*

5. *S. Peter represented the Apostles. The Apostles represent sometimes the Bishops, sometimes the whole Clergie. The Ministers of the Convocation represent the whole Church of England. The authoritie of Generall Councels. National Synods must be obeyed.*

6. *Private spirits censured. Interpretation of Scripture not promiscuously permitted. An Anabaptisticall woman displayed.*

7. *An other woman reproved for her new-fangled book in print. Scripture [illegible] anagrams in Hebrew, much lesse [illegible] reverence. How farre the people are to believe [illegible].*

8. *Saul represented [illegible]. Joshua and the Princes binde the Kingdome of Israel for long time after.*

9. *Christ represented [illegible] Christ and Adam like in some things, in others unlike. Christ did and doth more good for us, then Adam did harm.*

IT hath been plentifully evidenced, that death entred into the world by sinne; and that both Adam and we were sentenced to die for one sinne, the first sinne onely of Adam onely; and not for any other sinne or sinnes of him, or any other our remote, propinque, or immediate parents;

and

and that death reigned from Adam to Moses even over those that had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression, Rom. 5. 14. Ladde, Death shall live, raigne, and prevaile (though not reigne) from Moses unto the end of the world. For when this mortall shall have put on immortality, then (then and not till then) shall be brought to passe the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory, 1. Cor. 15. 54. and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, 1. Cor. 15. 26. Aquine on Roman. 5. lect. 4. thus, Because originall death reigned from Adam by whom originall sinne came into the world unto Moses, under whom the Law was given, and death is the effect of sinne, especially originall sinne, it appeareth, there was originall sinne in the world before the Law; and lest we might say, they died for actuall sinnes, the Apostle saith, Death reigned even over those who sinned non proprio actu, as children. So he.

The things themselves then being unquestionable, and before elucidated to the full, That death is inflicted for originall sinne, and that we all and every of us (except Christ) have contracted originall sinne; it followeth justly, by the judgement of God, that death is appointed unto us for this sinne. Tertullian lib. 1. de test. Animæ. [a] Man is condemned to death for tasting of a small fruit — and now they all perish that never once acquainted with Paradise: and let me adde, They are most justly punished. Neither but men cavill, or cast aspersion of unrighteousnes upon God. For though man be but of yesterday (yea though the childe be born but this minute) yet by reason of their originall sinne in Adam, and with him, they were justly sentenced in Adam unto death almost six thousand yeares ago. Yet though God needeth no defence from the actions and behaviour of men, yet from their usances and customes generally received, from their right and equitie daily practised, let us ascend to behold the blamelesse course in the like of the Almightie. Do we finde a young snake, viper, or other venemous or hurtfull beasts, birds, or the egges of a cocatrice, we destroy them, not for the harm which they have done, but for the kinde sake, and for the spoil which they may do. Do not prodigall great heirs waste and scatter abroad estates assured to posteritie? Do they not cut off intailes, annihilate and void perpetuities, draw inheritances dead in succession, consume them wholly on gut, or groin, to the everlasting prejudice of their issues? Did not the disobedience of Queen Vashti unto her husband do a wrong, not to the King Ahasuerus onely, but to all the princes, and all the people, Esther 1. 16. and, as being exemplaria, was punished accordingly? If the unchastity of the High priests daughters be [illegible]

[a] Homo damnatur in mortem, ob unius arboris gustū delibatum: — & perierunt jam omnes qui nullum Paradisi cespitem adierunt.

Levit. 21. 9. and therefore she was to be burnt alive, though other whores were put to milder deaths: if an evil done to a brother striketh up to the abuse of the father, as it doth, (for *God rendered the wickednesse of Abimelech which he did unto his father, in slaying his seventie brethren*, Judges 9. 56.) then why might not the wickednesse of a father descend in some sort upon the children, in a storm of wrath and punishment?

3. The husband representeth the wife: what bargain he maketh, she maketh: they are one flesh. The great commandment, to keep the sabbath, was given to sonne and daughter, to servants and to strangers, but not to the wife. She was forbidden in her husband, which the rest were not, but dividedly: so was Eve forbid in Adam, not inhibited her self, but in him who represented her. The men of Israel represented the women, and the women had good by the actions or passions of the men. The females were redeemed in the males, every male gave a ransome for his soul unto the Lord, all and every one, rich and poore alike, even half a shekel, and *they gave this offering unto the Lord, to make an atonement for their souls*, Exod. 30. 15. Women were partakers of this benefit, and in the mens atonement was the womans comprized. Neither were the females presented to the Lord, but the males, the males onely and the women in them, and by them, but not in their own persons. In Gods due claim to the beasts, these three conditions were to be observed. First, that the beasts should be clean, and so not swine, not horses, camels, dromedaries, elephants, or the like, but onely these three kindes, sheep, rather beasts, and goats, were the Lords (unlesse you will make up the number, foure, with an asse, which was to be redeemed with a lambe, or his neck to be broken, Exod. 13. 13.) For though it be said Exod. 13. 2. *Sanctifie unto me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the wombe among the children of Israel, both of man and beast: it is mine*: Yet you must not extend the words to dogs, or cats, or things unclean, but onely to such clean beasts as God hath appointed for sacrifices. Yea, though it be said, Numb. 18. 15. *The firstling of thy clean beast, thou shalt redeem*: You must know, there is a double uncleanesse. First, that which is unclean throughout all its *species*, as swine, and horses, and the like. Secondly, that which is unclean by accident, and is contra-opposed to perfect and unblemished, Levit. 22. 22, 23. as *blinde, or broken, or maimed, or having a wen, or scurvie, or scabbed, or which hath any thing superfluous, or lacking in his parts*: such beasts, even of clean beasts, as sheep, goats, &c. the Lord counted unclean, and claimed them not. Those that were thus unclean by accident,

were

were to be redeemed: and to that place of Numbers is to be understood, and not to be wire-drawn, as if God did claim the unclean beasts to be his. The second condition, That those clean beasts should be first-born: *Thou shalt set apart unto the Lord all that openeth the matrix, and every firstling that cometh of a beast*, Exod. 13. 12. Thirdly, these clean first-born or firstlings must not be the females, though they first open the matrix, but the males; *in sexu primo natus masculus*, as the Septuagints have it, Exod. 13. 12. *The males shall be the Lords*. Semblably in the case of mankinde, women were not the Lords claim, but the men onely, and the women included in the men. For though it be said in generall termes, Exod. 13. 13. *All the first-born among thy children thou shalt redeem*, yet the women were not redeemed but in the event, and the men onely were offered. Luke 2. 23. *Every male that openeth the wombe shall be holy*. Openeth the wombe by extramission and ejection, not by intromission and injection, as the Hebrew phrase importeth: the Greek is thus, *πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν*, *Omnis masculus primogenitus*, as Beza reads it, *Omne masculinum*, as the Vulgat hath it, according to that, Exod. 22. 29. *The first-born of thy sonnes thou shalt give unto me*. From whence let me infere this conclusion, That the first-born had his denomination from the mothers first birth or parturition, as well as from the fathers first generation. Exod. 11. 5. *From the first-born of Pharaoh, to the first-born of the maid-servant that is behinde the mill*. The Septuagints stile the first-born, not *πρωτογενῆ*, with reference to the fathers act, but *πρωτοτόκους*, from the mother; and Christ is not called *πρωτογενὴς*, from a carnall father (for he had none) or *πρωτότοκος*, but *μονογενὴς*, John 1. 18. and *πρωτότοκον αὐτῆς*, Luke 2. 7. *her first-born sonne*. Which *πρωτότοκος* is ill interpreted by the old Bishops bibles, Mat. 1. 25. *first-begotten*, and by the Genevean translation as ill rendered, Luke 2. 7. forsaking their good rendering of it, Mat. 1. 25. But our late translation, in both places aptly hath it *the first-born*, and not *first-begotten*. Though Jacob saith, Genes. 49. 3. *Reuben, thou art my first-born*: yet Leah might have said the same words as well; for he was the first-born of both: Yea, I dare say, if a man had more wives at once, as Jacob had; or successively, as many others; the first male childe of each of these women by the same man may justly be called his first-born; and every one of these first-born children, if they had lived under the Leviticall law, had been consecrated to God. And therefore Reuben having lost his birth-right, the double portion which had been due to him, (and was due to the first-born under the law, Deut. 21. 17. and was part of those *Jura primogenitura*, and one of the *προτερια* mentioned by the Apostle, Heb. 12. 16.) was by Gods appointment, and Jacobs just

just allotment bequeathed to Joseph; Genes. 48. 5. And of him were two tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh: whereas no other of the children of Israel had more then one tribe. *For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler; but the birth-right was Joseph's*, 1. Chron. 5. 2. and not Judahs. For Joseph was the first-born of Rachel, the first-love of Jacob, the first wife in the light, in right, and in intention: And so her eldest sonne Joseph was in right to be the first-born of Jacob: and her self is preferd in place, not onely by Jacobs affection, but long after, by the Spirit of God, Ruth 4. 11. *The Lord make the woman like Rachel and Leah.* Shall I step one step further? I may say, That if the willing and witting act of Jacob, preferring Ephraim, the younger sonne of Joseph, before his first-born Manasseh, did onely signifie, that Gods blessing went not alwaies hand in hand by the prioritie of birth, and that God makes birth-rights according to his pleasure, and not according to mans reckoning: Yet three other passages reach more home, to prove, That Joseph was the first-born. First, because Jacob blessed Joseph two severall times, Genes. 48. 16. and 49. 22. which he did unto none of his other children besides; and withall, he gave him *one portion above his brethren, which he took out of the hand of the Amorite with his sword and with his bow*, vers. 22. besides the parcell of ground in Shechem, where Joseph was buried, *And it became the inheritance of the children of Joseph*, Josh. 24. 32. which was also a prerogative above his other brethren. Secondly, because Jacob blessed Josephs children before he blessed his own children, Genes. 48. 16, &c. Thirdly, because Jacob blessed both Joseph in his children, and his children in his blessing, and blessed none of his childrens children, by name, separately, and particularly, but Josephs children onely (though divers of them had little ones before Jacob went into Egypt, Genes. 46. 5.) and Joseph himself Jacob blessed *with the blessings of the breasts, and of the wombe*, Genes. 49. 25. Which words, as they do promise a kinde of fruitfulnesse, (which was taken from Ephraim, by barrennesse, when it was said, Hosea 9. 14. *Give them a miscarrying wombe and drie breasts*) so I remember not, that ever the posteritie of Joseph had extraordinarie number of issue above other tribes, answerable to Jacobs extraordinarie blessing; but Judah, and his ofspring onely, had more men of warre, *from twentie yeares old and upward*, then both the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, Num. 1. 26, 33, 35. and therefore, in all likelihood, had more children from twentie yeares downward. Which words, I say, viz. *The blessings of the breasts, and of the wombe*, as they may in a second sense imply a numerous ofspring; so in the first sense, I conjecture, they pointed

ed at the primo-geniture of Joseph and his children. Sure I am, *the birth-right was given to the sonnes of Joseph*, 1. Chron. 5. 1. and *the birth-right was Josephs*, vers. 2. and perhaps, even in this point, Jacobs blessings *prevailed above the blessings of his progenitours*, Genes. 49. 26. For Abraham prayed once that his first-born sonne, by his concubine, might be blessed: *O that Ishmael might live before thee!* saith he to God, Gen. 17. 18. and Isaac would have blessed his first-born Esau: *Make me savourie meat, such as I love, and bring it to me, that I may eat; that my soul may blesse thee before I die*, saith Isaac to Esau, Genes. 27. 4. though before-hand Esau had sold his birth-right unto Jacob, Genes. 25. 33. Neither Abraham, nor Isaac prevailed in their wishes: but Jacobs blessings prevailed above the blessings of his progenitours, because, whom he desired to blesse, God blessed; and he gave, by Gods allowance, the primo-geniture to Joseph whom he loved, and to whom, in some regard, it was due before Reuben.

I return to the old matter, and opine, That when a batcheler marrieth with a widow, which had had a sonne by her former husband, her first man-childe by the second husband was not a first-born, nor so accounted in the law. And if after a woman had had seven husbands, and daughters onely by each of these, she had been married also unto the eighth husband, and should have a sonne by him, though he had had divers sonnes before by other women, yet this his sonne by this woman is, in the eye of the law, a right first-born childe, and sacred to the Lord; and to be redeemed, not with the generall redempion of every male, half a shekel, of which I spake before, but with the particular redemptions of the first-born. Redemptions were of two sorts: the first is expressed Numb. 3. 45. where *the Levites are taken in stead of all the first-born, and the cattell of the Levites in stead of their cattell*. And because there were two hundred and seventy more of the first-born sonnes of the Israelites, then all the male Levites came unto, every one of these odde 270 paid five shekels to the Lord for their redempion: which summe of five shekels was ever after, during the law, the price of the redemption of the first-born sonne, Numbers 18. 16. which was the second kinde of redempion.

I cannot omit to shew the means which God used, to prevent the cosenage about things consecrated. They were not to do no work with the first-born bullock, nor to shear their first-born sheep, Deuter. 15. 19.

It is also remarkable, first, that Pharaoh commanded the midwives of the Hebrews, Exod. 1. 16. *If it be a sonne, ye shall kill him*: and gave in charge after to all the Egyptians, his subjects, *Every sonne that is born ye shall cast into the river, and every daughter*

daughter ye shall save alive, verſ. 22. Secondly, that Moſes was the ſonne of a Levite, expoſed to the danger of the water; and therefore called Moſes, becauſe he was drawn forth, Exod. 2. and after called by God, to revenge this wrong and others upon Pharaoh. Among which plagues, this was a great one, to ſlay their firſt-born: and as the juſt retaliation uſed by God in other things, yea in this, was not to deſtroy their daughters, but their ſonnes; ſo in his mercy he would not deſtroy all their males, but the firſt-born onely; which you muſt not underſtand of their daughters, though they were firſt-born, but onely of their males. For when it is ſaid, Pſal. 78. 51. *He ſmote all the firſt-born in Egypt, the chief of their ſtrength*; you cannot imagine that women were the chief of their ſtrength, but the men onely. And God taught the people to ſay, Exod. 13. 15. *The Lord ſlew all the firſt-born, &c. therefore I ſacrifice unto the Lord all that openeth the matrix, being males*. And as the firſt-born males onely were ſacrificed, ſo onely were the firſt-born males redeemed. And accordingly all the male Levites were taken for the male firſt-born of Iſrael: and at the moſt righteous maſſacre of the firſt-born males of Egypt, the Iſraelites eſcaped by the bloud of a lambe without blemiſh, *a male of the firſt yeare*, or a ſonne of the firſt yeare, Exod. 12. 5. From whence you may ſee the groſſe errour of Cornel. Cornelii à Lapide, who thinketh, That if a woman had had a daughter firſt, and ſonnes after, her firſt ſonne had not been her firſt-born, but her daughter, becauſe ſhe opened the matrix firſt; when it is evident, that if a woman had had many daughters before one ſonne, yet her firſt ſonne was her firſt-born in the Law. And God ſaith, Exod. 12. 24, *Ye ſhall obſerve this thing for an ordinance to thee, and to thy ſonnes for ever*: viz. the ordinance of keeping the Paſſeover. I recollect, & apply theſe things thus, The men of Iſrael repreſented the women, The firſt-born ſonne, and not the daughter, was the Lords due, The male Levites were inſtead of the firſt-born ſonnes, All firſt-born males were redeemed, Women received good by the mens circumciſion, and by mens redemption, which was in one kinde or other, whether they were firſt-born or not firſt-born. And though the deviliſh ſuperſtition of the Turks now circumciſe women (as Joannes Leo reporteth) yet by Gods appointment women were neither to be circumciſed, nor redeemed, but as they were in men, and as men repreſented them.

4. Let me come yet nearer to the main purpoſe. The Apoſtle ſaith, 1. Corinth. 12. 26. *Whether one member ſuffer, all the members ſuffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoyce with it.* From whence I thus argue, As at the committing or deed-doing in murder, the murderers hand may be ſaid to will the murder; not becauſe there is any

will,

will, ſtrictly taken, belonging to the hand; or becauſe there is ſinne properly in the right hand, which doth but its duty in obeying the ſouls domineering diſpoſition, or *dominium de ſpoticum*: but becauſe the hand is part of that man, in whoſe ſoul the will was that commanded the murder; and becauſe the ſoul is *principium totius individui*, the fountain from which all members take life, and uſe motion, and by the ſoul the motion was derived to all the other parts of the body. So were we, and every one of mankinde, willing to commit the ſinne with Adam; not as if we had been there actually to agree or diſagree, but as we were parts of him who was the fountain of humane nature, which conveyed corruption unto all mankinde. Semblably in the puniſhment: though the right hand onely give the blow, and actuate the murder; yet upon the delinquents apprehenſion both hands are pinioned, both feet fettered, the neck is haltered, and the whole body ſueth it; yea, ſoul and all, without repentance. So, though Adam onely ſinned that firſt great ſinne, yet becauſe he did it repreſenting us, Adam alone is not puniſhed for it: but we that are bone of his bone, and fleſh of his fleſh, all that are members of the firſt Adam are guilty of the fault, and condignely are puniſhed, if we be unrepentant. For as the divers members of a body, are part of the perſon of one man: ſo all and every man is, as it were, a part and member of humane nature. And thus by the participation of the *ſpecies*, more men are one; and one, more: we Adam, and Adam was we. But let us go out of man himſelf, and look to other faſhions of the world, in matters politicall. Do not the ſeverall men in a Townſhip or Corporation make one body thereof, and the whole Corporation is, as it were, but one man? and what a few do, is it not the act of all? of which he complained, who ſaid, *That Mr. Maior, for his own particular, was an honeſt man, and ſo were all the brethren, who promiſed him fairely; but* (becauſe, contrary to their promiſe, they pinched upon him) *the Corporation was a knave*. Doth not the Houſe of the Commons repreſent the Body of the Realm, in the Parliament-time, though the thouſand part of the ſubjects be not preſent? and what they enact, the abſent enact; what they deny, the abſent deny: and what immunities and priviledges they obtain, for ſucceſſion as well as for themſelves they obtain them: and what ſervices, tributes, ſubſidies, or taxes they yeeld unto, all the reſt of the Realm muſt yeeld unto, and pay: yea, by the truſt repoſed in them, they binde or looſe the whole Kingdome; ſometimes in ſuch things as others would never have conſented unto, and yet muſt undergo, and ſee performed. In the fifth book of the Hiſtorie of Portugal, the Univerſities and Divines of Alcala, among other things, truely decreed, and religiously guided Philip the

second towards the attaining of the crown of Portugal, in these words, saying, that, *When as Commonwealths do choose their first King, upon condition to obey him and his successours, they remain subject to him to whom they have transferred their authority; no jurisdiction remaining in them either to judge the realm, or the true successour, seeing in the first election all true successours were chosen.*

Every man is considered doubly. First, as a singular person: so onely his own proper actions belong to him. Secondly, as a member of a society: so what the Prince, or the whole citie, or the greater part do, doth concern him: For *so saith the Philosopher*, saith Scharpius the Divine. Much more did Adam represent our persons, when, what he willed and performed, we willed and performed, we being in him, as many waters in a fountain all to be corrupted, if he were corrupted, all to be pure, if he continued pure; all to live by his righteousnes, all to die by his iniquity.

Furthermore, in the famous battell between the three Horatii and the three Curiatii, did not they represent both the armies and both the peoples? the Horatii, of the Romanes: the Curiatii, of the Latines? Did not their wills, their strength, their fortune depend on the wills, strength, and fortune of those combatants? did not the Latines fall into subjection by the death of the Curiatii? and did not the Romanes thrive and prosper by the valour of their surviving Horatius? Yea in the Scripture, long before this battell, *there went out a champion out of the camp of the Philistines, Goliath of Gath*, 1. Sam. 17. 4. with a proud challenge, and bold defiance; *Am not I a Philistine, and you servants of Saul?* Then he articleth, *Choose you a man for you, and let him come down to me. If he be able to fight with me, and to kill me, then we will be your servants: but if I prevail, and kill him; then you shall be our servants, and serve us.* It should seem, the Philistines referred themselves to his successe: for when David had undertaken the duely, and *when the Philistines saw their champion dead*, (they fought not a stroke) *they fled. And the men of Israel and of Judah pursued, wounded, and killed them*, vers. 51, 52.

Yea, in our own country, if upon imposed crimes by an appellant, the defendant shall yeeld, or be overcome in battell; *He shall be put to death with grievous or more grievous pain, according to the quality of the crime, with the disinheriting of his heirs, and losse of all his goods.* Furthermore, though he were slain, yet the *formality of the Commandment* preceding, *adjudgeth him to capitall punishment, that thereby his posterity may suffer the grievous concomitants of his detestable villany*; saith that most learned Mr. Selden, my most reuere-

b *Ultimo supplicio punitur, cum pœna gravi vel graviori, secundum criminis qualitatem, cum exheredatione hæredum suorum, & omnium bonorum amissione.*

one and loving friend, in his *Duells, or Single Combat*, pag. 38.

5. But let us come from the sword, where things are cut out with more rigour, if not cruelty, unto matters Ecclesiasticall, and so more civil and peaceable. Did not S. Peter stand in stead of all the Apostles, when Christ said to him, Joh. 21. 15, 16. *Feed my lambes, Feed my sheep.* And again, *Feed my sheep*, vers. 17. Likewise when Christ said to him, Matth. 16. 19. *I will give unto thee the keyes of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt binde on earth, shall be bound in heaven: whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.* And when this promise to Peter was promised to the rest of the Apostles also, Matth. 18. 18. and when both these promises were fulfilled and accomplished, as they were after Christs resurrection (and not before) and authoritie given, and by a solemne ceremony exhibited by Christ, not onely to S. Peter, but to all and every of the Apostles, saying, Joh. 20. 21, &c. *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosesoever sinnes ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sinnes ye retain, they are retained.* Did not the Apostles represent the whole body of the Ministery: unlesse you will fable, that in the Apostles dayes they had more need of remission of sinnes, then we have now; or that Christ loveth not his Church now, nor affordeth the like means of pardon and reconciliation, as he did in those times. But by the same deceitfulnesse of cavillation, you may say as well, that when Christ brake bread, and gave it to his Disciples, and said, *Take, eat, this is my body: and gave the cup to them, saying, Drink ye all of it*, none but they might eat, or drink the Supper of the Lord. But it is undeniable, that when Christ said to his twelve Apostles, Luke 22. 19. *This is my body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me*, he spake it to them as representours of the whole Priesthood onely: who onely have power to consecrate the body and bloud of our Lord. Indeed Hierome saith, *What doth a Bishop, except Ordination, which a Priest doth not?* as if the Apostles represented the Bishops in that point onley: and the Centuriators acknowledge, that the first Bishops, after the Apostles, were made Bishops by the Apostles: and they say no more then is confirmed, 1. Timothy 5, 22. and Titus 1. 5. Act. 14. 23. But other Fathers extend the comparison between the Apostles and Bishops to other matters; appropriating to the Bishops, above the Presbyters, the power of Confirmation, and divers other things. All which though we grant, yet no man will deny but for preaching, baptizing, and especially for consecrating of the Eucharist, and Sacerdotall Absolution, or Ministeriall Remission of sinnes, the Apostles represented not the people in

[a] *Quid facit Episcopus, excepta Ordinatione, quod Presbyter non facit?* Epist. 85. ad Evag.

in any wise, nor the Bishops onely, but the universall body of Christs Ministers.

And do not, among us, the Right Reverend Arch-bishops, and Bishops, and the Clergy, assembled in the Convocation, represent the whole Church of England? are not they our Nationall Councel? do not their Articles of Religion binde in conscience all and every one of the Church of England, as much, if not more then Civill lawes? Nay is there the like humane authority on earth, for the setling of our consciences in matters of Scripture, or Scriptures controverted, or to be controverted, as the externall publick breathing voice of a true Oecumenical Councel of the Patriarchs, Bishops, and choice Divines of the Christian world. The essentiall, universall Church of Christ is (and we must beleeve it is) *the house of God, the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth*, 1. Tim. 3.15. It never erred, it cannot erre, its judgement is infallible. *The Spirit leadeth* this Church *into all truth*, Joh. 16. 13. Of the Church of God, consisting of the faithfull in any one age or time, I dare say, it never did erre damnably, or persisted in smaller errours obstinately; but always some truly maintained things necessary to salvation: and unto this fluctuant militant part of the Church, Christ hath promised to be with it *to the end of the world*, Matt. 28.20. The whole visible Church at no time can fall into heresie, but some seek after the truth, and embrace it, and professe it. Subject it is to nesciency of some things, and perhaps to some kinde of ignorance, but it cannot erre in things necessary, nor in lesse matters, schismatically, with obdurate pertinacy.

Of the representative Church of Christ in Councels, this may be said truly and safely: viz.

Of the first six Generall Oecumenicall Councels, not one, *de facto*, erred in any definition of matters of faith. Of other lawfull general Councels, that may hereafter be called, though I will not deny but they may possibly be deceived, as they are men, and therefore are not free from errability (but if such Councels may erre, or pronounce amisse, cannot coblers?) yet there is least likelihood of their erring. Such Oecumenical Councels have the supremest, publick, externall, definitive judgement in matters of Religion; if any oppose them, they may not onely silence them, but censure them with great censures, and reduce them into order. Private spirits must sit down and rest in their determinations, else do the Councels lose *operam & oleum*. What S. Ambrose, Epist. 32. said of one generall Councell, *Al follow the decisions of the Nicene Councel, from which neither death nor sword shall be able to separate me*: I say of all true and generall Councels, and of the major part of them, who binde the rest: without which issue, the gathering of Councels,

a *Sequar traditam Nicani Concilii, à quo me nec mors, nec gladius poterit separare.*

yea and of Parliaments also, would be ridiculous. For though it were a true and just complaint of *Ambrose Ordinar. Quinquecclesiensis Episcopus*, That in the Councils of Trent, the voices were rather numbred then weighed: yet he doth not, he cannot finde fault with that course, in a just and lawfull Oecumenicall Councel: but directeth his complaint against the tyrannicall power of the Pope, who made unlearned men Bishops, as many as served his turn, and more would have made, if more need had been. Bishops *pompaticall, and onely for shew* (as Lampridius said of Persius his souldiers;) namely, titular Bishops, void of learning, void of Churches, void of good consciences, and mercenary parasites.

a Pompatici & ad spectandum.

Concerning our Nationall Church, till a lawfull General Councel may be celebrated, both Pastours and people of England are to obey her Decrees, Injunctions, Articles, Homilies, and our approved, last, best Translation, above Coverdales, Thrdals, or any private ones. Therefore, *Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves: for they watch for your soules, as they that must give account*, Heb. 13. 17. *And you are to follow their faith*, ver. 7.

6. The Devil brought not a more dangerous Paradox into the Church of God this thousand yeares, then this, That every one illiterate man or woman, as their pleasure may judge of Scripture, and interpret Scripture, and beleeve their own fancies of the Scripture, which they call *the evidence of the Spirit*: and the contradicting them, (though with truth) they esteem as *the not convincing*, nor *clearing of their conscience*. So that Nationall Councels are of no esteem, Generall Councels not of much: the sheep will not heare the Pastours voice; but to their pleasure censure them: for, *All may erre*. The Spirit from heaven (as they suppose) doth as well dictate the sense to them, as it did sometimes the words to the holy Pen-men thereof. Let such seduced ones know, They have the cart without the horses and horsemen: whereas the Prophet Elisha was called (and other Church-governours may be called) *the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof*, 2. Kings 2. 12. They have the words with the Eunuch; but want both Philip to be their guide, and the humblenes of the Eunuch, who was willing to be instructed, Act. 8. 30. Though they have the letter, yet they may misse the true literall sense; which is not in divers places to be measured by the propriety of the words onely, or principally, as in proverbiall, parabolicall, and mysterious sentences. The literal sense is the hardest to finde. c *They that follow the bare letter, do kill the Sonne of God, who is wholly perceived in the Spirit*, saith Hierome of some such, on Matt. 26. 21. Presumptuous and illiterate Expositours are like the Carriers or Posts, hasting between Princes, having letters of

c Simplicem sequentes literam occidunt Filium Dei, qui totus sentitur in Spiritu.

truth in their packets, but ſealed up; ſo that they cannot ſee nor know them; while their mouthes are full of leaſings, falſe rumours, and lies. They have the ſpirit of ſelf-conceit and pride. Theſe men little think, that they who *wreſted ſome hard places in S. Paul, as they did alſo the other Scriptures*, wreſted them *to their own deſtruction*, 2. Pet. 3. 16. What ſhall become of thoſe, who wreſt eaſie places? Theſe dream not, that [g] *it belongs almoſt to the ſame authority, to interpret, and to make*: That they are to reſt on the Generall Commiſſion given to the Prieſt, *Teach all nations*: (therefore others muſt learn:) That the Prieſts lips muſt preſerve knowledge, and the people muſt fetch the Law from their mouth: That an implicite belief in depths beyond their capacity, is better then adventurous daring to take from the holy word of God that divine ſenſe which it hath, and to faſten their own falſe ſenſe upon it. Tertullian ſaith, [h] *The truth of the Scripture may be depraved as well by a falſe gloſſe, as by corrupting the text.* Hierome thus, [i] *The Goſpel is not in the words, but in the ſenſe; not in the outſide, but in the marrow; not in the leaves of ſpeeches, but in the root of reaſon.* Irenæus 2.25. [k] *It is better for the ignorant to continue in the love of God, which quickneth a man, and to ſeek no other knowledge but Jeſus Chriſt the Sonne of God crucified for us, then by ſubtilties of queſtions and much talking to fall into impieties.* And Auguſtine, *Serm.* 20. *de verbis Apoſt.* [l] *A faithfull ignorance is better then a raſh knowledge.* Again, S. Hierome *ad Demetriadem*, ſpeaketh of unlearned men, [m] *Knowing not how to ſpeak, they cannot hold their peace, but will needs teach the Scriptures which they underſtand not, and be maſters of the ignorant, before they be diſciples of the learned. It is good to obey our elders, to ſubmit to thoſe that are ſet over us, and next to the rules of the Scriptures, to learn of others how to live, and not to be led by our own preſumption, the worſt guide of all others.* Excellent is the counſel of Gregory Nazianzen to theſe fanaticall giddy-brain'd private ſpirits; *Ye ſheep, preſume not to lead your Paſtours, &c.* If a Jew, a Turk, a Devil convince thy conſcience, thou muſt follow it: ſhall the governour of thy ſoul have no other power over thee, then Jew, Turk, or Devil? Or was the Miniſtery ordained in vain? In vain indeed it was ordained, if every one be his own judge, or a peremptory judge of his guide. If great learned men may be deceived; may not the ignorant man much more? I dare truely avouch, that the unlearned, ſingle-languaged-interpreting-lay-man, hath all the faults whatſoever learned men have, and ſome other, eſpecially ſuch as are the offſprings of ignorance. That wiſe Hiſtorian Philip *de Commines*, in his 3. book 4. chap. reckoneth it as an unſeemly thing to reaſon of Divinity before a Doctour. The world is turned topſi-turvey: the great and moſt learned Arch-

[g] *Ejuſdem penè auctoritatis eſt interpretari, cujus condere.*

[h] *Tantum veritati obſtrepit adulter ſenſus, quantum corruptor ſtylus.* De Præſcript. adverſ. hæret. cap. 17. & 39.

[i] *Non eſt in verbis Evangelium, ſed in ſenſu; non in ſuperficie, ſed in medulla; non in ſermonum foliis, ſed in radice rationis.* Comment. in Galat. 1.

[k] *Melius eſt, nihil omnino ſcientem perſeverare in dilectione Dei, quæ hominem vivificat, nec aliud inquirere ad ſcientiam, niſi Jeſum Chriſtum Filium Dei, pro nobis crucifixum, quàm per quæſtionum ſubtilitates, & multiloquium, in impietates cadere.*

[l] *Melior eſt fidelis ignorantia, quàm temeraria ſcientia.*

[m] *Quum loqui neſciunt, tacere non poſſunt, docentq; Scripturas quas non intelligunt; prius imperitorum magiſtri, quàm doctorum diſcipuli. Bonum eſt obedire majoribus, parere præfectis, & poſt regulas Scripturarum vitæ ſuæ tramitem ab aliis diſcere, nec præcepture ante peſſimo, ſcilicet præſumptione ſua.*

Archbishop of Canterbury was confronted by a tobler; yea confounded; if we will believe that monster of men, that incarnate devill, Martin Mare-Prelate, who thus sung of his Idoll,

Who made the godly Cobler Cliff
For to confound his Grace?

I warrant you, the spirit, the private spirit, by which the fool presumed that he was guided. Sleidan, *Comment.* 22. *fol.* 266. saith it was one of Charles the fifth his Edicts, [a] *that no man take upon him to dispute publickly or privately of the sacred Scripture, especially of doubtfull and hard points, or to interpret it; except he be a Divine that hath the institution of some approved Universitie.* It was an holy Edict, breeding reverence to the sacred word of God, and I could wish it were in practise with us; though I must needs confesse, the breach of the edict was too severely punished: for the men were to be beheaded, and the women to be buried alive, though they desisted from their errour; but if they were obstinate, they were to be burned, and their goods confiscated. Yet the rebellions of the Anabaptists in Germanie may be some cloke for that cruell sentence; which rebellions also (forsooth) were moved by the Spirit of God; if, for example sake, you will give credit to Thom. Muncer his oration unto the armed rebellious clowns: [b] *We are sure* (saith he) *that I began not this action by any private authoritie of mine, but by a divine injunction, &c.* And again, [c] *Ye your selves shall see the manifest help of God.* And he had Scripture to confirm it; Scripture in word, not in sense; Scripture misapplied, things falling out contrary to his propheticall Spirit: for they were overcome, and he beheaded. Likewise Sleiden, *Comment.* 30. *fol.* 28. saith of the Anabaptists, [d] *they said they had conference with God, and a mandate from him, to kill all the wicked, and then to frame a new world; wherein none but the godly and innocent should live.* This I will say of mine own knowledge, that when that man of happy memory, the late right Reverend, now most blessed Saint, Arthur Lake, Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, appointed Doctour Sclater (now also a Saint of heaven) then my most learned loving friend, and sometime fellow-Collegian in the two royall Colledges at Eaton and Cambridge; with my self, to conferre with an Anabaptisticall woman; we heard her determine great depths of Divinitie as confidently as ever S. Paul did, though he was taught by Christ himself; and as nimbly as ever an ape crackt nuts: yet so ignorantly, and with such *non-sense*, that we both wondred at her incredible boldnesse. The Revelation she had at her fingers ends; she thought that she understood it better then S. John himself; and defined in a few houres conference more depths of Divinitie, then six Generall Councels would in a long time. Mysteries were no mysteries to her: if

[a] *Ne quis de Sacra Scriptura, maximè de rebus dubiis & difficilibus, privatim aut publicè disputaret, aut ejus interpretationem sibi sumeret, nisi sit Theologus, qui publicâ alicujus Academiæ institutione habeat.*

[b] *Constat nobis, explicatum esse me hanc actionem, non meâ quadam auctoritate privatâ, sed jussu divino.*

[c] *Videbitis ipsi manifestum Dei auxilium.*

[d] *Cum Deo colloquium sibi esse, & mandatum se habere aiebant, ut impiis omnibus interfectis, novum conflituerent mundum, in quo pii soli & innocentes viverent.*

if an Angel of darkness, or one from heaven instruct her contrary to her fanatick prepossest imagination, she would conclude, *He or she that commeth with it, hath not the Spirit instructed her in the right way.* A fit consequence for such a *pseudo-prophetissa.*

But what do I speak of her self-conceit, when of late another of her sex hath printed a book of her phanaticall crudities, and by English anagrams expounded Scripture? A new kinde of interpretation never thought of, fit for a woman to be the inventour of. She teacheth Daniel to reveal himself after a new fashion: and such things, which, were he alive and naked, he must say he never thought of. She thinks she untieth knots, and giveth light to prophesies, but indeed misapplieth things really, and perhaps some contingents, to present times: and while she gathereth many excellent stains of words and sentences out of the divine Writ, in coupling them together she maketh such a roaring hough-potch, as if she had vowed to write full mouthed *non-sense* in lofty terms; others not knowing, nor perhaps herself, what she aimeth at. Take a taste of her anagrams:

DANIEL. I AM EVIL.

Yet did not he send all prophesies, nor all things.

MEDES AND PERSIANS. SEND MEE SPANIARDS.

What would she do with them? it was feared that they would have come too soon for her and others too.

THE NEVOY COME. THEN BORE NOXOWSKY.

Like you this? you shall have more as bad, as void of wit.

PATRICK OF PARSIA. I CAN POPE PREACH.

If Friers should come, and prevail, they would teach her to be more humble.

DARIUS THE MEDE. I DREAMED THUS.

Awake dreamer: no sense is in thy dreams, much lesse religion. Was ever Scripture made such a *nose of wax?* did ever any religious heart think, such could be the meaning of those words? Let me but touch at her obscene exposition of the end of Christs Circumcision, pag. 55. and consider her fanaticall imagination, that the Spirit of God by Michael understood King James, pag. 50. And the warre in heaven with Michael and his Angels, against the Dragon and his Angels, is thus expounded by her, pag. 55. *The fray is fought by seconds: by Michael is meant King James; the Dragon is the Pope, whom Michael overcame by the blood of the Lambe, and by the testimonie of so many Bishops, and other faithfull, crowned with the glory of Martyr-*

Mayerdome: whereas King James had never a Bishop so crowned, and never a Bishop was so crowned since he was born. Holy, peaceable, and harmlesse King James, who would scarce hurt a worm, is now interpreted to be the greatest fighter among the celestiall host.

I could wish she would repent for her blasphemy, pag. 70. where she writeth, *That the person of the Sonne of God (not made) was turned into a lump of clay*: and for her pointing out the day of judgement. For though she confesseth, pag. 99. *Of the day of doome no man knoweth, no not the Angels that are in heaven, nor the Sonne, but the Father*; yet she addeth, *The account of this book of note is by centuries of yeares*. Suppose it were so, (as it is not,) could not Christ and his Angels know the day by the computation of centuries, as well as she? but she, by a new account, hath found out (as she imagineth) what Christ and the good Angels were ignorant of, namely, the exact day of doom. For thus she determineth, pag. 100. *There is nineteen yeares and a half to the day of judgement, July the twenty eighth one thousand six hundred twenty five*. Has not this woman been better never to have seen Scripture, then thus to prophane it, and take Gods word in vain? You think you have the Spirit of God, as you write in the last page: but I am sure, if you repent not betimes, for your wire-drawing of Gods words, and intruding into hidden and unsearchable depths of Divinity, you are in a desperate case, and all the Separatists and Brotherists of the Brether-lands, where they say your book was printed, cannot defend you. Let the women rather go to their needle, and their spindle. *Let the women learn silence with all subjection*. 1. Tim. 2. 11. *But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man*, (as she doth, if the vsu expositus) *but to be in silence*, saith S. Paul.

Quis expediunt cunctis fera corda libris?
Risusque decent vetera cana senis?

Cornelius Cornelii à Lapide defies such the severest censure of the Inquisition, for expounding the word of God by an Hebrew anagram, on Exod. 28. 18. though he cites a piece of Scripture for a parallel. Indeed S. Hierome on those words, *Shesach shall drink after them*, Jeremie 25. 26. interprets it to *Babel*: because if you mingle in the Hebrew Alphabet the first letter with the last, the second with the last save one, and so forth, till you come to the middle, and invert the order of reading, which we do for the memory of children, as for example ת ש ר ק ץ פ ע ס נ מ ל כ י ט ח ז ו ה ד ג ב א when you are come to the middle ל and מ do meet, they that which in the ordinary and forward reading is *Babel*, in the inverted reading is *Sheshach*. I appeal to hand him, thus writ in one line, the Hebrew Alphabet, beginning with ת and ending with א in another line begin with ב

ry, and end with ב: what in the right way is *Babel*, in the froward way is *Sheshach*. For כ the second letter being doubled, and ל the twelfth letter in their proper places and rank, make with their vowels, *Babel*; and ש the second letter being also doubled with כ the twelfth letter in the alphabet, in the preposterous posture of them, with the same vowels, do make *Sheshach*; & therefore *Babel* is called *Sheshach*. *Magno conatu, meras nugas: Great ado about meer trifles.* Indeed the Rabbines have many mutuall oppositions of letters in the inverted alphabet, and none so ancient as this, as Bertram in his *Comparatio Grammatica Hebraica & Aramica* truly observeth; and of the Cabalisticall interchanging of letters, he preferreth this *Athbasch* above all: yet is it more nice and curious, then sound or religious; neither can S. Hieroms authority give authority or allowance to this mingle-mangle-kinde of interpretation: his authority in this point being weakened by his slender conjecture. *I think* (saith he) *that the Prophet Jeremy did prudently conceal the name of Babel, lest the besiegers of Jerusalem should be enraged against him.* but (say I) otherwhere he nameth *Babel*, as Jeremy 50. 18. and layeth a burden upon the kingdome and citie of Babylon, upon her Princes and her wise men, both in the 50 and 51 chapters. Yea in the same 25 chapter, ver. 12, Jeremy saith from God, *I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation.* Which inconvenience Lyra foreseeing, therefore, perhaps, the rather thinketh, that *Sheshach* is the name of the Egyptian King, and that *Pharaoh* was the common name, as afterward *Cesar* was the common name of the Emperours, and *Julius* a proper name. This is evident, there was a *Sheshach*, king of Egypt in the dayes of Solomon, 1. King. 11. 40. and there might also be a second *Sheshach* after. But Lyra himself on Jer. 51. 41. saith, that *Sheshach* in that place is used for *Babel*; and I am forced to say, that no part of the 51 chap. toucheth on the woes of Egypt, but purposely is bent against Babylon; and it is not likely that the same Prophet would call two distinct kings, or two distinct kingdomes by the same word *Sheshach*. Therefore Lyra is out of tune in this strain. But why then is *Sheshach* put for *Babel*? If no reason could be assigned, yet the word of God is not so to be dandled withall, or rather to be tortured, as to draw expositions out of anagrams; and therefore the Jesuit was justly blameable, to make this place a pattern of his anagrammaticall interpretation. Mr. Selden *de Dis Syris, Syntagm.* 2. *Cap.* 12. saith, *Sheshach may seem to be an idol of the Babylonians, a she-idol, or perhaps* (as it is in his *Addenda*) *a masculine Deity*, but he leaveth all to conjecture; wherein though he hath done excellently, yet I rather follow in this point Tremellius, who on Jeremy 25. 26. observeth, that *Sheshach* in the Babylonish tongue doth signifie *Diem festum celebrans*,

beasts, and so may signifie, either *the King*, or *the City*, *keeping a festivall day*: Which was never without feasting. Now that both the feast was kept, and the festivall day designed to the worship of their idols, may be judged by the event, Daniel 5. 4. where *they praised the gods*, and for so doing was Belshazzar reprehended, vers. 23. Tremellius addeth, that Jeremy by this one word did demonstrate with his finger the very day of the King of Babel, and Babylons fall; as if he had said, *At a feast he shall be slain, that is, In her feasting the city shall be destroyed.* For as the Lord prophesied by Hiiah, *Prepare the table, watch in the watch-tower, eat, drink*; Isai 21. 5. where both the feast, and the fall of the King of Babel, and of the city also is divinely foretold: so God gave a second warning, Jeremy 51. 39. *In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoyce, & sleep a perpetuall sleep.* Where Babylons feasting-destruction is named; then followeth, *I will bring them down like lambs to the slaughter*, verse 40. whereupon he crieth out in the 41 vers. *How is Sheshach taken?* that is, *Diem festum celebrans*, either *the feasting Belshazzar*, or, *the feasting city overthrown?* Concerning the King, the Scripture saith, Daniel 5. 1. *He made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine, and whiles he tasted the wine, he commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels of the temple of Jerusalem, and in the same hour the fingers of a mans hand wrote his destruction, and that night was he* (the wine-bibbing Sheshach) *slain.* Concerning the city, I proved before out of Jeremy, that her destruction was to rest upon her intemperance; and so, *Quomodo capta est Sheshach, id est, Civitas diem festum celebrans?* And indeed I rather incline to this latter exposition, in this place, because also of the words immediately following, *How is the praise of the whole earth surprised?* (but neither Belshazzar, nor Sheshach, if it were an idol, were the praise of the whole earth.) *How is Babylon become an astonishment among the nations?* If you judge it to be the idol; because it is said, *Quomodo capta est Sheshach?* I first answer, that in that feast service was done to many idols of gold and silver, braile and iron, wood and stone; Daniel 5. 23. but that Sheshach was the chief among them, or that any one idol of them was so named, is yet to be proved. Therefore the second answer may stand good, that there is no necessitie of making the word *Sheshach* to be the proper name of a King, City, or Idol: it may rather be an appellative. For Jeremy saith not, *How Sheshach hath past over*, which (as I said) you might expect, *Quomodo festum celebrans bibit passa est*, *The King celebrating a festivall drunk after that*, though Tremellius hath it thus, *Quomodo festum celebrans bibit, &c.* I cannot deny but there were such an idol among them as was assigned to Sheshach (which in our impu-

enqui-

enquiry, yet unproved) it might, as well as *Bel*, *Merodach*, and *Melcom*, signifie the people which worshipped it. Till that point be evidenced, I will say with Tremellius, that the forbearing to name the King, or veiling the name of the city, and describing him or it by what was prophesied they should be doing or acting, (as indeed it fell out) is to be referred *ad* [r] *majestatem orationis*, *to the gravitie and weight of the speech*: wherein the Scripture keepeth its majestie, and neither with bitter invective, nor harsh exprobration, but with composed gravitie, and eloquent solemnitie designeth the King or Babylon out, not expressely, by his or her name, but by their actions: as Nabals name was applied by his own wife, to signifie his churlish nature, 1. Sam. 25. 25. *Nabal is his name, and folly is with him*: and Jerusalem is called *the holy city*, for the holy things there done, there contained. I conclude thus, If anagrammes from the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriack, or Greek, languages in which the words of holy Scripture were writ, may not be admitted (as indeed they may not,) much lesse may we expound the sacred Originall by English anagrammes, the flashes and fire-works of luxuriant brains.

Hearty reverence, and a kinde of ceremonious civill adoration beseemeth the word of God. It is not much prating, or pridy-self-love, that makes the good expositour. *The silence of swannes is not overcome by the noise of swallows; but when the swallows are grown hoarse, the swannes shall sing*, saith Nazianzen. The application is easy. Josephus, in his second book against Apion, saith of the Jewish high priest, *He shall judge of doubtfull matters, and punish those that are convicted by the law. Whosoever obeyeth not him, shall undergo punishment, as he that behaves himself impiously against God.* The great, dubious, perplexed scruples & difficulties were not left to the judicature of private fancies. *Artificum est judicare de arte*, *It belongs to artisters to judge of the art*, is a maxime of infallible truth. Hierome upon these words, Eccles. 3. 7. *A time to keep silence, and a time to speak*, thus; [s] *We learn no art without a teacher; onely this is so mean and so easie, that it needeth no teacher*: and he speaketh by Ironie of those who are rath-ripe in religion. Aristotle Ethic. 1. *Every one judgeth aright of those things which he knows; and this is a good judge.* And thus is called by Ockam our countryman, [t] *the judgement of certain and veridicall knowledge*. Luther divinely, [u] *It is not lawfull for Angels, much lesse for men, to interpret Gods words as they list*: much lesse for women, say I. Tertullian in his time styled them *heretically women*, that dared to teach, and contend in argument: and nothing truer then this, that [x] *Ignorance breeds confidence, learning fear, and discourse*. *What is more bold then blinde boldnesse? To the word of God we must adde nothing, detract or pervert*, saith Aquin. *No prophesie of the Scripture is of any private interpretation*, 2. Pet.

r. De qua Hermog. Tom. 4. de inventione.

s Omnes artes absq; doctore non discimus; sola hæc tam vilis & facilis est, ut non indigeat præceptore.

t Judicium certæ & veridicæ cognitionis.

u Non licet Angelis, medium hominibus, verba Dei pro arbitrio interpretari.

x Imperitia confidentiam, eruditio timorem creat.

Peter no Apostle, nor his writings no Prophecie? If the Decalogue, and all the rest of the Scripture, were a written law, by which people should be ruled or judged, (as for example, concerning theevery) and appoint no living judge to determine who offend against the law, and who are punishable or not punishable, but leave every one to judge himself by the written law, and every one to interpret the law to his pleasure, were it not a foolish law, as much, and indeed more than none? And shall God give us a law containing all truth, and permit the interpretation of it to every one? The supreme judge in matters of Faith and Religion, in every Kingdome of Christian government, is the National Councell thereof: till there be found some *power upon earth, that can be* [illegible] for the Universall Church of Christ, a true and free generall Councell from which is no appeale, it being the supremest earthly judge on earth.

Yea but the Bereans [illegible] and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so. Acts 17. 11. Shall they examine the very Apostles doctrine, and not we the doctrine of our Pastours? I answer, first, These Bereans were learned and eminent men, but every unlearned man now, that hath skill only in the English, may conferr with the profoundest Clerks. Secondly, these Bereans were unbelevers before the examination of those things: for immediately it followeth, *Therefore many of them believed, and of honourable Greek women and men, &c.* Are thou an unbeliever? Do thou then as those unbelevers did. If thou believest, shew me one passage of Scripture, where ever the unlearned people did call the doctrine of their learned Pastours into ques.

I confesse, that the judgement of the Scripture and Creed is onely authentick, and perfectly decisive. And if we could exactly hit on the true meaning, all differences were quickly at an end. Nor do I monopolize learning to the Clergy, when I confine and restrain the judgement of learning to the learned. Many there are among the people, who in all literature, humane and divine, exceed many Priests and Pastours: they were more in number, and that way more abundantly qualified. With the Churchmen it would be better, since *Learning hath no enemy but the ignorant.* There are flames of wisdome, and sonnes of knowledge. As *Wisdome is justified of her children*, Matth. 11. 19. so learning is not to be judged by the unlearned, but by her children.

I acknowledge, that all and every one of the people are to answer for their thoughts, words, and deeds; and that God hath given them a judgement of discretion in things which they know: but in matters above their knowledge,

* Scientia [illegible] habet inimicum, praeter ignorantem.

* Δεῖ τὸν μανθάνοντα πιστεύειν.

and transcending their capacitie, they have neither judgement to discerne, nor discretion to judge. *Ne sutor ultra crepidam.* Shall blinde men judge of colours? *Sus Minervam, Hannibal quis Hannibalem docuit?* Who taught Hannibal warre? *Discentem oportet credere.* He that learnes must believe, saith Aristotle.*

Hitherto belongs that monstrous opinion of Tolet and others in the Papacy, *That it is meritorious in simple men to be misled by their Pastors.* And yet all truth is not at all times to be published to all alike. Christ forbad the Apostles to carrie the truth to the Gentiles and Samaritans, who were then in an indisposition to believe. Matth. 10. 5. *Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into no City of the Samaritans enter ye not.* Matth. 7. 6. *Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine,* Matth. 7. 6. By which (saith S. Augustine, *De adulterinis conjugiis* l. 2. c. 27.) Again, Matth. 16. 20. our Saviour *charged his Disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ* (namely for some time) which yet himself published, as he saw occasion, John 5. 18. and 10. 30. and 18. 37. and died for the publishing of it, sealing the truth with his bloud. Mark 14. 64. 1 Tim. 6. 13. Yea, Christ himself concealed divers things from his own Apostles, and from some Apostles more then from others. Peter, James, and John did see more then the rest of the Apostles, and were commanded to conceal the Transfiguration even from the rest of the Apostles. *Tell the vision to no man until the Sonne of man be risen again from the dead,* saith Christ to them, Matth. 17. 9. and yet the knowledge of the Transfiguration was none of the necessary points to salvation. Christ at first taught obscurely, as it were by shadows and resemblances both his death by the amphibolous words, *Destroy this Temple,* Joh. 2. 19. and his insurrection and ascension by insinuating in the type of the brasen serpent lifted up, Joh. 3. 14. For Christ was lifted up, or exalted both by men, *when you have lift up the Sonne of man,* Joh. 8. 28. and *by the right hand of God,* Acts 2. 33. Yea, God *superexaltavit eum,* highly exalted him, Philip. 2. 9. After he spake more plainly, *and he began to teach* his Apostles of his sufferings and resurrection, Mark 8. 31. and that *openly,* ver. 32. which is confirmed by specializing of the time, Matth. 16. 21. *And see where, From that time forth he began Jesus Christ, to demonstrate:* insomuch that his Disciples said unto him, *Lo, now thou speakest plainly, and speakest no proverb, or parable,* John 16. 29. And the Apostle, 1 Cor. 3. 1. 2. acknowledgeth, that he *fed them with milk,* because *they were not able to bear strong meat:* insomuch that *he could not speak unto them as unto spirituall, but as unto carnall, as unto babes in Christ.* Could not, that is, could not conveniently, could not, to their good or edification. *A young man is not a fit hearer of moral Philosophie,* saith Aristotle,

Briefly thus, All religions under heaven, the true and the falsely called religion, have had their *arcana, their secrets and mysteries*, the patefaction whereof was not promiscuously imparted to every one of the vulgar or illiterate sort: who sometimes hit upon a good belief, and by it may *rapere cœlum, take heaven by force* (in the phrase and sentence of S. Augustine) *while learned men may be thrust to hell*; but indeed know little with the perfection of knowledge. It must be confessed, that it was the accursed policie of our adversaries, to nuzle up the people in ignorance: but *Buy the Bible*, saith S. Chrysostom; *Search the Scriptures*, saith Christ, John 5.39. Let all the people daily reade or heare them, meditate on them, and labour to follow them: let them who have any learning interpret them according to the competency of their gifts, and in their own families instruct the more unlearned. What said King Henry the eighth, Decemb. 24. in the 37 yeare of his reigne? (as it is in Stows Chronicle, enlarged by Howes, pag. 590) and to whom said he it? *Be not judges your selves of your own phantasticall opinions, and vain expositions: For in such high causes you may lightly erre. And though you be permitted to reade holy Scriptures, and to have the word of God in your mother-tongue, you must understand, it is licensed you so to do, onely to inform your consciences, and to instruct your children and families; and not to dispute, and make Scriptures a railing and a taunting stock against Priests and Preachers, as many light people do.*

Queen Elisabeth also shewed her dislike in Parliament, March 29. in the 27 yeare of her reigne (in Stows Chronicle, pag. 702) saying, *I see many overhold with God Almighty, making too many subtile scannings of his blessed will, as Lawyers do with humane testaments. The presumption is so great, that I may not suffer it, — nor tolerate new-fangledneſſe.* So she. Humilitie, and subjection of spirit ought to be in every Prophet to the Prophets: and shall the unlearned take up presumption as a buckler? and arm himself with obstinate singularity, (which is a branch of pride) as with a sword? As I would not have the people, with the Papists, as it were, to hoodwink and couer their eyes, that they may be led by others; and glory in blinde obedience, which little differeth from wilfull, and stupid ignorance, but advise them to unmuffle their heads, and open their own eyes, and judge of things which they do or can know, & are skilfull to judge: (but [a] *Ignorance in a Judge is as bad as injustice*, and a simple unlearned Judge is a mischief, as intolerable, as unheard of) so do I wish the people, to avoid the other extream of Separatists; who thinking they know all things, though they have no heavenly inspiration, will seem wiser then their teachers, and taking up opinions for truth, and malepert obstinacy for humble constancy, disrepute their Pastours, disregard all authority, and ascribe nothing to that sovereigne generall commission, *He who heareth*

[a] *Ignorantia in Judice æquiparatur dolo.*

heareth you, heareth me: which is enough to ſeal up their mouthes and captive their thoughts unto their learned Paſtours, in things which themſelves cannot apprehend, and their Paſtours can well judge of.

Oh but men are men; and as men, may erre. I hope, the unlearned people are not Angels, nor more free from errour then the learned. Yet we muſt be led by our conſciences. True; and your conſciences even therefore ought the rather to be well grounded, and founded; not upon the ſlippery ſand of ſelf-conceit, but on knowledge, as on a ſure and ſafe rock. And in whom ſhould knowledge reſide, if not in your Paſtours?

But in Queen Maries daies ſhould a man have been led by his Paſtours, when themſelves were at ods, and the greateſt part awry? Or how ſhould a true Proteſtant, and now a ſubject of Spain, in Spain behave himſelf? How much is left to his power of diſcretion, when the whole Eſtate, both Eccleſiaſtick and Civil, runneth with a torrent the contrary way? If he be led by his conſcience, and oppoſe them; there followeth (with the hideous, ſecret, moſt feared, and affrighting torments of the Inquiſition) confiſcation of goods, and ſometimes ſhamefull, commonly a painfull and violent death. If he rely on the advice of the Paſtours, he ſinneth againſt his own conſcience, and againſt truth. Who can, or will direct this wavering Chriſtian, in ſuch uncertainty of wayes, that he ſtep not aſide, nor be out of the right path?

O gracious God, *ſend out thy light and thy truth; let them lead me,* Pſal. 43. 3. Let them direct my diſcourſe, and illuminate it; that it may be to the anxious and ſcrupulous conſcience as a guide, to direct the way; and as a lanthorn, to give it light in the way.

S. Hierome and Ockam, and Doctour Field, (of the Church 4. 13.) three moſt eminent in three ages (a Father, a Schoolman, and a pillar of our Church) do counſel good men, in ſuch a caſe, to ſilence and mourning in ſecret, as the Prophet Jeremy did: *Men* (ſaith he) *have nothing left unto them, but with ſorrowfull hearts to referre all unto God.* I ſhould rather, under correction, ſay, That a Chriſtian thus perplexed is to take theſe courſes, which thoſe Divines, perhaps, did preſuppoſe as neceſſary preparatives, but did not expreſſe.

Firſt, I adviſe that man, whoſe conſcience runneth a ſingular way, *to waſh his heart from wickedneſſe,* Jerem. 4. 14. *to lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godlineſſe and honeſty:* which is pointed at, as a means whereby men may come to the knowledge of the truth, 1. Tim. 2. 2. &c. For *unto the wicked God ſaith, What haſt thou to do to declare my ſtatutes, or that thou ſhouldeſt take my covenant in thy mouth?* Pſal. 50. 16. Ezek. 20. 3. Yes, but *thou art confident that thou thy ſelf art a guide of the blinde, a light of them*

which

which are in darkenesse, an instructer of the foolish, a teacher of babes, having the forme of knowledge and of the truth in the Law. Rom. 2. 20.

I answer, Thou must also take the qualifications and necessary appendants of a reformer, following in their place immediately. *Thou therefore that teachest another, teachest thou not thy self?* &c. Thy self must not be ignorant, thy self must not steal, not commit adultery, nor commit sacrilege, not break the Law, nor dishonour God. For, as it is Wisd. 1. 5, 6. *The holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without understanding, and will not abide when unrighteousnesse commeth in. For wisdome is a loving spirit.* Never were the uncharitable, ignorant, or sinnefull men, fit undertakers to contradict established doctrines, disciplines, or commonwealths. But, *Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brothers eye,* Matth. 7. 5. Reasons more than ordinary will be expected by God and good men from him who leapeth out of the Church in which he was born and bred, kicking at the breasts of his mother, running with the bit in his teeth his own wayes. I conclude this first point thus; *He who will needs runne such singular courses, had need be a man of rare sanctity, and of singular good endowments of knowledge.*

Secondly, I would have him earnestly to pray for humility, and to practise it. By pride Satan cast himself out of heaven, Adam him and his out of Paradise. David said, Psal. 131. 1. *Lord, my heart is not haughty, nor neither do I exercise my self in great matters, or in things too high for me.* And vers. 2. *Surely I have quieted my soul as a childe that is weaned of his mother: my soul is even as a weaned childe.* On which words, suffer me to make a little excursion, by way of explanation.

Concerning the first passage: If David had appealed to men, some scruple might have remained: but saying to God the searcher of hearts and reins, *Lord, my heart is not haughty,* he maketh his humility unquestionable.

In the second passage, observe, that though he was a King and a Prophet, yet some things were too high for him, by his own confession. Nazianzen, *Him I count humble, not that speaks humbly and modestly of himself, or that speaks courteously and humbly to his inferiour, but that speaks modestly concerning God, and knows what to speak and what to conceal, and in some things can confesse his ignorance, and yeeld to them to whom the office of teaching is committed.* On the contrary, *The object of a proud man is himself, and he is higher in his own conceit then is fit,* saith Cajetan. Pride exalteth a man, humilitie casts him down and as all pride shall be at the last thrown down, so all true humilitie shall be exalted. I would not go to heaven by pride: no man ever went to hell by humilitie.

a Objectum superbi est ipsemet, celsior quàm ei decuerit.

In the third passage, this is the sense: May my hopes, or God himself

himself, fall me, may evil betide me, (for this, or some such like imprecation antecedent is to be understood) *si non posui os meum ad faciendum peccatum animæ meæ*, as it runneth in the Hebrew. The oath it self, or imprecation is not expressed, that people may learn to be abstemious in swearing. In which regard also it is said, Eccles. 23. 10. *Ne assuescat os tuum juramento, nec nominatio*, *Let not thy mouth be acquainted with swearing, nor naming God.* Where the Vulgat and Septuagint omit the name of God, though it be necessarily understood, and is expressed in our best translation.

In the last passage, remember that we ought all, in this point of humilitie, to be *as little children*, if we will *enter into the kingdome of heaven*, Matth. 18. 3. David addeth, *My soul is as the weaned childe*, not in this respect, that newly weaned children are commonly more froward (similitudes hold not in every particular) but as the mother applieth mustard, wormwood, and other bitter things, to her breasts, that she may keep her childe from the milk which he desireth, though she know it inconvenient, or hurtfull for him: so God did wean David, by the bitter remembrances of death, fear of Gods judgement, and the pains of hell, and by crosses also of this life, sicknesse, banishment, envy in court, insurrection of his own sonnes, and the like, from those pleasurable things which David affected, but God knew to be naught for him. There was never any arch-heretick, or grand impostour, but made private ends his cynosure, self-conceit and self-love his card and compasse.

Even after God had wondrously appeared unto Moses, and gave him his mission, Moses replied, Exod. 3. 11. *Who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh? &c.* and Exod. 4. 1, 2. his backwardnesse further appeareth: yea, after, though God by his two miracles confirmed the calling, yet twice more did he declare, that he was afraid to begin so great an alteration, Exod. 4. 10. and especially at the 13. vers. insomuch that the Lord was angry. Humblenesse, which is alwayes accompanied with modesty, bashfulnesse, measuring ones own strength, and subjection of spirit, is to be prayed for, and practised by any scrupulous Christian, before he make himself a formall partie of opposition or contradiction.

The third requisite followeth, That this holy and humbled man conferre with more learned men, and specially with his Pastour. If his Pastour give him not sufficient satisfaction, let him conferre with other Divines. Yea, if he be a Pastour himself, yet let him take heed of singularitie, the daughter of pride: and let him not lightly or sleightly esteem of their judgements, who more abound in knowledge, or to whom a direction of souls is by God himself more especially committed, who are, in matters above his capacitie, his proper judges, and he is in such things, to subject himself unto them. I doubt not, but,

if

if his superiours should mislead him in things surmounting his knowledge and capacities, his humble, conformable obedience, and desire to be better resolved of God their Brother man, who without knowledge of any true ground dissenteth on a truth, grows collective and presumptuous, though he be ready to die for the truth. Above all things, let him not apply himself to such men alone, as he knoweth to be addicted to his own way, nor come with prejudice to hear the contrary part: but since he will not rest in other mens determinations, he who will be an upright judge, ought indifferently to hear both causes pleaded, and, after all good and necessary procedure unto true judicature, to judge with right judgement. This is a rock, upon which many split themselves, who pretend to seek out the truth, but go onely to such as they know before-hand do run with al lyes to their humour, and will animate them in their singularitie: and thereby, in stead of instruction, are flattered in their folly, and confirmed in their erroneous conceits. [b] *He that determineth any thing before he hath heard both parties, though he give just judgement, he is not a just judge.* And again I say, [c] *Ignorance in a judge is an high injustice.*

When this godly man is humbled, when this humble man hath conferred with his own Pastour, and other learned men and Ministers, and impartially heard both sides, and still rests unsatisfied from others, and his conscience still fevered, that he hath the truth; I wish him, not blindely to give over himself to others, but, keeping the staffe of direction, and the exercise of his judgement of discretion, (for things within his verge, or reach) and following the weyes of his own conscience, in the fourth place, I would counsel him to remove into other parts. So Elijah fled from Jezebel, yet poured out his complaints to God, 1. King. 19. 3, 10, 14. So our Saviour, when the Jews would have stoned him, *hid himself*, John 8. 59. And he directed his Apostles *to flee from one citie to another*, Matth. 10. 23. S. Paul *through a window was let down in a basket by a wall, and escaped*, 2. Cor. 11. 33. and God himself *hid Baruch and Jeremy*, Jer. 36. 26. This many, both learned and unlearned, did in Queen Maries dayes, and God hath given a great blessing oftimes to this course. So S. Cyprian fled at the first, and then, during his voluntarie exile, wrote diverse excellent matters, and yet afterwards died a glorious Martyr.

In the fifth place, if the good Christian will not, or cannot flee, I would have commended unto him silence and mourning, as the Prophet Jeremy did, which S. Hierom, Oecham, and Doctour Field prescribe as the onely means. Let him worship God in private, as Daniel did *three times a day, and prayed*, Daniel 6. 10. for God *will regard the prayer of the destitute, &c. This shall be written for the generation to come*, as it is Psal. 102. 17, 18. which

[b] *Qui statuit aliquid parte inaudita altera, Aequum licet statuerit, haud aequus fuit.*

[c] *Ignorantia in Judice summa est malitia.*

Psalme is *a prayer for the afflicted when he is overwhelmed, and powreth out his complaint before the Lord*: for this is the very superscription of that Psalme. The Prophets *dayes consumed like smoke, and his bones burnt as an hearth*, vers. 3. *His heart was smitten and withered*, vers. 4. and *by reason of the voice of his groaning his bones did cleave to his skin*, vers. 5. He was *a pelican of the wilderness, and like an owl of the desert*, vers. 6. *like a sparrow alone upon the house top*, vers. 7. *while his enemies reproached him, and were mad against him, and sworn against him, he ate ashes like bread, and mingled his drink with weeping*, ver. 8, 9. The Lamentations of Jeremy would fit his mouth, and the dolefull complaints in divers Psalmes would well accord with them. But above all, he should call to minde, That there was no sorrow like Christs sorrow: That he alone trod out the wine-presse of Gods wrath: That he was reviled, spit upon, buffeted, whipped, crucified, & that despiteous piercing rent his very dead body. Let him solace his soul with spirituall comforts, and make melody to God in his heart, losing himself in speculation of Christs infinite merit, and applying to his own soul all heavenly joy. Let him withdraw himself from being seen in publick: let him embrace privacy and retiredness, living (if it were possible) under Jonas his gourd, or in vaults, whose darkenesse and blackenesse he expelleth by internall illumination, and spirituall irradiation. The Baptist, and our blessed Saviour himself, betook themselves to deserts and mountains for their solitary devotions, when errour and unrighteousnesse sat in the chair of Moses. Thus the persecuted holy ones of the Primitive Church served God, at the burial of their dead, *by nightly songs*, saith [d] Nazianzen, residing sometimes *in cryptis*, in caves and grots under ground, in dens, among the rocks. But suppose he be drawn forth, and cannot lie hid, suppose the Magistrate summon him to his tribunall, and examine him very strictly: how then ought this man to behave himself? First, I would have him to abhorre all mentall reservations. If he use ambiguity of word, phrase, or sentence, (which was the guise of the mysterious, enigmaticall oracles) if by an Aposlopesis, Irony, or any Rhetoricall figure allowed in art, practised among men, and conceivable by an intelligent auditour, he excuse, qualifie, and keep secret his own actions or other mens counsels; I will not wholly blame him: [e] *No man is bound to bewray himself: every one is tied to defend himself.* A traitour may without sinne plead, *Not guilty*, that is, *not proved guilty* at your barre; where [f] *Every one is presupposed to be good, till he is proved to be bad. I am not guilty, so farre, as I am bound to accuse my self.* And this is the allowed generall acceptation of that usance. Within the veil of ambiguous words there lieth a secret, second, homogeneall good sense, perhaps hid from some simple ones, yet discernable by quick, piercing, and deep apprehensions, a

d Orat. 2. in Julian.

e *Nemo tenetur prodere seipsum: quia tenetur defendere seipsum.*

f *Unusquisq; præsupponitur esse bonus, donec probetur esse malus.*

ſenſe couſin-germane in the ſecond degree to the words; a ſenſe involved, implicit, having traces and footſteps of reaſon; hard, yet inveſtigable. *Fuga in perſecutione* is allowed; this *ſubterfugium verborum* is but a branch of it. I will not condemn David for acting the part of a frantick man, to eſcape: *He changed his behaviour before them, and feigned himſelf mad in their hands, and ſcrabled on the doores of the gate, and let his ſpittle fall down upon his beard*, 1. Sam. 21. 13. Neither will I wholly diſlike a verball equivocation; while the ſenſe is tranſparent to the wiſe or learned, though veiled to the ignorant. Philip Cominæus, 4. 11. reporteth, that when the Conſtable of France, Earl of S. Paul, had played fouly and falſly on all ſides; King Lewis the eleventh ſaid thus unto Rapine, a truſtie ſervant of the Conſtable, *I am buſied with divers affairs of great importance, and had need of ſuch an head as thy maſters is.* The ſervant interpreted all comfortably, to the better ſenſe; but the King ſaid ſoftly to the Engliſh men and the Lord of Contay, *I mean not, that we ſhould have the bodie, but the head without the bodie.* This manner of amphibolous ſpeech our Saviour uſed, when he ſaid, *Deſtroy this temple*; which they underſtood of the temple builded with ſtones: *but he ſpake of the temple of his bodie*, John 2. 19, 20, 21. And in the eighth of John, Chriſt more then once made uſe of that homonymous verball equivocation.

But let him flee, as from a ſerpent, ſo from the deluſions of the ſerpent; who of late hath taught his locuſts to make an anſwer conſiſting, part in words expreſſed and intelligible, part of thoughts reſerved and unintelligible: the ſpeakers minde feigning, framing, and new-coyning a wilde ſenſe, which had no correſpondence with the words at all. So that, for example, if the Devil ſhould ask of a Jeſuite, *Wilt thou give me thy ſoul?* the Jeſuite may (by their doctrine) ſafely and ſoundly anſwer him, *I will give thee my ſoul:* provided alwayes, that he keep in the hollow of his heart this mentall reſervation, *If thou be God Almighty.* Thus the Jeſuite thinks, that he can cozen the Devil himſelf, becauſe indeed he is not able to finde out that unexpreſſed thought of the Jeſuites heart. Yet the Angel of darkneſſe perhaps laugheth, perhaps wondereth to ſee himſelf outgone in his own wilineſſe and depths, by his own children; though time will declare the truth, that by ſuch ſubtilties they undermine, and blow up, as with gun-powder, their own, and their adherents ſalvations.

I conclude the point: I will not condemn the man, who handſomely and artfully, without lying or mentall reſervation unconceiveable, can ſhift off danger and trouble from himſelf or his friends; but he condemneth himſelf, who uſeth ſuch double diſſimulation, ſuch *léger du cœur*: who plougheth with an ox and an aſſe; making up a mixt, linſy-woolſy propoſition, of words

words ſenſible and thoughts heterogeneall and incomprehenſible: incomprehenſible (I ſay) by any power or powers created; ſince the thoughts ſtrangely vary from the words, lurking in the vaults of the heart, and can not be fiſhed or hooked out from antecedents, or conſequents, or any other circumſtances.

But, if he be put to his oath, what ſhall he do? If the matter concern not his life, let him anſwer exactly. Biſhop Andrews ſeems to diſlike, *That a man ſhould be ſworn againſt his own life*; becauſe the Prophet, by Gods direction, made that particular exception, Jeremy 38. 15. and for other reaſons by that moſt Reverend Prelat mentioned, pag. 95. in his *Opuſcula*. Yet my opinion is, *If the life of Kings or Princes, or if the welfare of the Commonwealth be in danger, or any extraordinary miſchief be like to enſue*, (which was not the caſe of Jeremy; a Prophet, no traitour; an holy man, no plotter, contriver, or partaker with wicked ones) *a man may lawfully, by the Magiſtrate, be put to his oath, though it coſt him his life; or to the rack and torture.* Unuſuall harms muſt have unuſuall remedies. The particular nature will deſtroy it ſelf, to uphold the univerſall. Rather then there ſhall be a *vacuum*, fire will deſcend. [g] *Where ſinnes runne headlong, it is not fit that juſtice ſhould be tied to go by degrees*, ſaith Seneca. If the matter concern his life, he may be ſilent, he may appeal: It is [h] Aquins judgement on a caſe not much unlike; *If a Judge ask any thing beyond what he ought in law; the accuſed is not bound to anſwer: he may appeal, or otherwiſe avoid it lawfully; but, he may not lie.* And again, [i] *It is one thing to conceal a truth, another thing to propound a falſhood. It is lawfull to conceal a truth in ſome caſes (as when a man is not bound to anſwer, and when he is not bound to confeſſe it) [k] by any convenient means: Yet a man may not either ſay an untruth, or conceal a truth which he is bound to confeſſe:* [l] *Neither is it lawfull to uſe any fraud or deceit; becauſe fraud and deceit are equivalent to a lie.* But may not one equivocate when he is put unto his oath? I anſwer, That not ſo much as verball equivocation, much leſſe that lately invented and curſed *Chimæra* of mentall reſervation, is to be allowed. [m] *Deceit doth not excuſe, but aggravate perjurie*, ſaid Cicero long ſince. [n] Iſidore thus, *With what art of words ſoever a man ſwears; yet God, the Judge of conſcience, ſo eſteemeth it, as he to whom the oath is made doth underſtand it.* S. Hierome on Ezekiel 17. 19. thus, [o] *It is an opinion of the world, that it matters not, whether a man overcome his enemie by guile or by valour.* But this himſelf reſolveth; [p] *As long as thou doſt not ſwear, and enter into a covenant, uſing Gods name; it is wiſdome and valour either to deceive or overcome thy adverſarie any way thou canſt: but when thou haſt bound thy ſelf with an oath, then he is no longer thine adverſarie, but thy friend, who hath truſted thee, and is deceived through*

g *Ubi ſcelera per abruptum eunt, (per præruptum*, in the African phraſe of Tertullian) *iniquum eſt juſtitiam ad gradus teneri.*

h 2. 2. quæſt. 69. art. 1. in corpore artic.

i Art. 2. in corpore.

k *Per aliquos convenientes modos.*

l *Neque etiam licet aliquam fraudem vel dolum adhibere, quia fraus & dolus vim mendacii habent.*

m *Fraus non diſſolvit, ſed diſtringit perjurium.*

n De ſummo Bono 2. 13.

o *Sententia ſeculari eſt, —Dolus, an virtus, quis in hoſte requirat?*

p *Quamdiu non jures, & pactum non inieris ſub nomine Domini, prudentia eſt & fortitudinis vel decipere vel ſuperare adverſarium utcunq; poteris: cùm autem te conſtrinxeris juramento, unusquiſque adverſarius, ſed amicus eſt, qui tibi credidit, & ſub occaſione juriſjurandi Dei nuncupatione deceptus eſt.*

thoughts,

9 Qui diffidens petitum, quomodo effugiet? Etiam inter hostes seruanda fides est.

Non considerandum qui, sed per quem juraverit. Multò enim fidelior est ille, qui propter timorem Dei sibi creditis & depositum est, &c. qui per adjurationem, divinæ Majestati hostis fuit, imò jam amicus, & militat infidelis.

Matth. 26. 63.

Contra Marcionem lib. 4. pag. 286.

Justa & digna præscriptio est, in omni quæstione, ad propositum interrogationis petitionem debere spectare responsionem. Aliud consentientis aliud respondere, damnatum est.

Sensus responsionis non est ad aliud dirigendus quam ad propositum interrogationis, quæ inde ab initio à Christo, quod ad hominis quidem attinet.

Homil. 6. de Lazaro & divite Paul.

thoughts, so deep or them the fools, so their words are mongrel, strange, bivious, multivious. What writings under heaven of finite men have or can have such variety of meanings, as are in Scripture comprised under the words dictated by an infinite Spirit, whose whole, entire, exact depths, the meer creature never knew fully and perfectly? *If I might have my desire*, quoth S. Augustine, *I had rather speak in words, whose diverse senses might give occasion to divers profitable apprehensions, than in words that can have but one sense only*[7].

The second thing I would commend unto this examinate, is to give faire language to his Judges. Let him not be bold and malapert, nor use clamorous opposition. Denie not the grosse Syllogize in *Barbara*, but *Ferio*, (to parre his cause by all handling) yet if he be immoveably confident, let him say, *I cannot dispute, but I can die*: let him not provoke the Judge by words or actions ill advised. Eutalia being a girle about 12 yeares old, did spit in the face of the Judge, that he might the rather condemn her. The answer of Hannah, 1. Samuel. 1. 15, &c. when she was in bitternesse of soul, to the misjudging and uncharitably zealous Priest Eli, was as a sweet incense in the nostrils of God, and is a good lesson for all to take out, when they are called before the Magistrates, though hard measure were offered. *How long wilt thou be drunken, quoth he? put away thy wine from thee.* And she answered, *No, my Lord, I am a woman of a sorrowfull spirit, I have drunk neither wine, nor strong drink, &c. Count not thine handmaid for a daughter of Belial.* The manner of answering may be sinfull, though the matter be good: froward behaviour never beneficed a cause, but *a gentle answer pacifieth wrath*, Proverbs 15. 1. Taunting recrimination argueth a distempered spirit in the gall of bitternesse. How humbly did our blessed Saviour behave himself under the hands of unjust Judges? How constantly, zealously, and boldly (because they were inspired immediately from God) did the Apostles, Act. 4. plead for themselves, yet without malapertnesse, or irreverence? S. Paul his speech to the high priest deserveth a larger discourse. Acts 23. 5, Paul said, *I knew not, brethren, that he was the high priest.* Some think that S. Paul knew Ananias to be high priest, when he called him *painted wall*. I answer, if so it were, this is no fit example for sawcinesse to be used in our times, towards Magistrates. For, first, if S. Paul did know him he might speak, though not as a Prophet, yet illuminated and inspired from God which now is not in use. Secondly, he might speak as a Prophet, foreseeing an evil end to Ananias, *as indeed it came to passe* (saith Chrysostom.) Many one of those who now revile Magistrates, have the spirit of prophecying, denouncing contingent future things, which yet end in false prophesie; I will not call him a sawcy presumptuous fellow. Thirdly, though

[7] Homil. 6. de Laudibus Pauli.

though divers learned men think the contrary, and that he ſpake by an Irony, when he ſaid, *I knew not*: yet I perſwade my ſelf, that S. Paul, in truth, knew not (when he ſpake) Ananias to be the high prieſt, for theſe reaſons:

Firſt, becauſe he ſeemeth to put on the ſpirit of mildneſſe towards them that ſtood by him, who were alſo the ſame *ouerſeers, ſtanders by*, who had ſmit and buffetted him: and calling them by the charitable term of *brethren*, whom it had been fitter to reprove; it argueth his plain ſincerity, ſpeaking of his ſuperiour.

Secondly, if S. Paul had ſpoken by way of jeſt, irriſion, or Irony, when he ſaid, *I knew not, brethren, that he was the high prieſt*; he might well have ceaſed there. But ſince he bringeth in the ſacred Text, ſeriouſly, truly, and ſadly, to confirm his neſciency, and that there is no mocking with the divine veritie; with me it ſhall paſſe currant, that he ſpake from the bottome of his heart, when he ſaid, *he knew him not to be the high prieſt*. The Spirit never taught any inſpired to apply Scripture contrary to their knowledge, nor to cite the ſacred Text of truth to prove an untruth.

Thirdly, conſider the *Antitheſis* and oppoſition between the words. In the fifth verſe he ſaid ſimply, and directly, Οὐκ ἤδειν, *I knew not* where his ignorance is the more ſeriouſly profeſſed by the oppoſition in the ſixth verſe, τὸ δὲ Παῦλος, *But Paul knowing that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Phariſees*: as if the Spirit had ſaid, *Paul indeed was ignorant who was the high prieſt; but he knew they were divided into factions*: the word *But* running with a ſingular emphaſis to this point.

Fourthly, by this expoſition we ſhall cut off that objection, which Julian the Apoſtata uſed againſt S. Paul, as if, by this double dealing, he were a very time-ſerver in his words; we maintaining all to be done in ſolemn gravity, and reality of truth.

Fifthly, if S. Paul had ſpoken Ironically, that he had not known the high prieſt, when they knew one an other; how eaſily could the high prieſt have confuted and confounded him, and laid lying and impoſture to his charge? But this he did not do: therefore, in likelihood, S. Paul knew him not.

Laſtly, the objections for the former opinion are eaſily anſwered. How could he be ignorant, who was the high prieſt, when he was breed up in their law, and well acquainted and familiarly in their *Synedrion*, and had been there, when S. Stephen was condemned, and when he got letters from the high prieſt, a little before his converſion? eſpecially, ſince he appealeth to the high prieſt, as to his warrantie, Acts 22.

To the firſt point, I confeſſe, he was bred up in their law, and could not *thus* in likelihood be ignorant who was the high

prieſt, or what was his name: yet *now* he might be ignorant; for S. Paul had been away from Jeruſalem a good while, avoiding the ſtorm of perſecution; and high prieſts died as other men: and at that time there were two high prieſts, which was not of old: and with one of them he might not be acquainted.

Oh, but he frequented the *Synedrion*. I confeſſe, that not onely *the witneſſes laid down their clothes at a young mans feet, whoſe name was Saul*, Acts 7.58. but that *Saul conſented to the death of S. Stephen*, Acts 8. 1. and as certain that he (as a principall agent) *received letters from the high prieſt, and all the eſtate of the elders*, to ſearch out the Chriſtians, and *to bring them to be puniſhed*, Acts 22. 5. and ſo he muſt needs know the high prieſt and the elders, and they him: and therefore, in likelihood, he was converſant ſometimes in their *Synedrion*. But I ſay as before, this might not be that high prieſt, who ſat to condemn S. Stephen, or to whom S. Paul appealed as witneſſe: but the other high prieſt might ſit at this time, and on this day; ſince now and then one ſat, now and then an other, and ſometimes both of them. And thus S. Paul might be ignorant, who was his Judge.

Oh, but he well knew the high prieſt by his place and by his clothes. I anſwer; The Jews were not now ſitting in their Councel-houſe, but where the chief Captain commanded them to appeare, Acts 22. 30. himſelf ſitting as the Moderatour in his own tribunall; which he was not wont to do in their *Synedrion*: neither might the high prieſt take the proper veſtments in ſuch a place, by which he might be known from others.

To cloſe up all; If nothing ſaid before do ſatisfie thee, but thou art confident, that S. Paul did know the high prieſt; (though thou wert better to adhere to the words) yet have I found out an other way for the opening of this point, which hath perplexed many learned men. Obſerve therefore, I pray thee, theſe things:

Firſt, that not onely the high prieſt, but all their Councel were ſummoned to appeare, Acts 22. 30. and of the Councel each man had liberty to ſpeak at his pleaſure: and at ſuch publick trialls there is a great dinne, murmures, and mutterings; ſo that the ſpeaker is not alwaies diſcernable, whiles many may ſpeak at once, and ſome louder then others.

Secondly, while *S. Paul earneſtly beheld*, not the high prieſt onely, but *the Councel*, Acts 23. 1. (caſting his eyes from one to another) *the high prieſt commanded him to be ſmitten on the mouth*. Theſe words S. Paul might heare: and yet not know, in ſuch a confuſed noiſe, which of thoſe his many Judges ſpake them: and in likelihood thought, that ſuch an unjuſt ſentence could not proceed out of the high prieſts mouth: but to the ſurbour

of those words, whosoever he was, to that unjust Judge S. Paul sharply and punctually replied, *God will judge thee, thou painted wall.* But when S. Paul was informed, that they were the words of the high priest himself; he was sory for his quick speech, and said, *I knew not, brethren, that he was the high priest.* So that, if S. Paul had known the high priest, and the high priest him; if they had been well acquainted the one with the other, at this time of S. Pauls triall (which will never be sufficiently proved,) yet here is now a new way, as probable as any, to excuse the Apostle from dissimulation, and from using the Scripture as a cloke to it; *viz.* Though S. Paul knew the man to be the high priest, yet he knew not at first that it was the high priest, who pronounced so unjust and furious a sentence: but divers of the seventy two Judges might be speaking one to another; and S. Paul might be mistaken, at first, in the speaker. As if he had said, *I knew not, brethren, it was the high priest* that spake those words concerning me.

And thus, I hope, this difficultie is cleared. I will onely adde this, That divers ancient Fathers from S. Pauls example, in this place, prove his modesty, moderation, and undisturbed passions, by his sudden, wise, setled answers. And, That I hold this paraphrase probable, as if S. Paul had said, *If I had but known that was the high priest who used those words, though I should not have forborn others, yet I would have forborn him; since God had said,* THOU SHALT NOT SPEAK EVIL OF THE RULER OF THY PEOPLE.

But yet this man that is sought out, and drawn into judgement, and answereth (as he ought to do) truly, without mentall reservation, modestly, and as befitteth him to answer unto his superiours: if he receive no satisfaction in his conscience; and his judges doom him worthy to die, what shall he now do? Shall he be over-ruled by his superiours, both spirituall and temporall, doing as they do, and thinking as they think? shall he go against the dictates of his own conscience? or shall he adventure his blood and life? Now, for my self, would I by Gods grace, I will prescribe no man to another. First, before I would sacrifice my life, I would once more recollect my former thoughts for humblenesse of mind, and diligently consider, whether the matters for which I am to suffer death, be abstruse or deepe, beyond my reach or capacity? If they be very intricate, I have cause to think, I have (and am not ashamed to say so) things which I know not, and cannot comprehend, &c. Gen. 20. 15. &c. Secondly, I would in this case, before I expose my blood, bring my intentions to the touchstone, call to minde, that good intentions alone cannot excuse me before God, if my good intentions were not grounded and regulated by S. Paul with good reasons pertaining to Christ, and not injurious;

injurious: but he *did it ignorantly, in unbelief*, 1. Tim. 1. 13. where an ill belief, though meaning well, is counted unbelief. In a good intention S. Peter would have dissuaded our Saviour from death, but he was called *Satan* for it, Matth. 16. 23. though Christ had blessed him before, and promised him excellent gifts, vers. 17. &c. I cannot think, but they who offered their children unto Moloch, did think they served God rightly, though indeed they served the Devil: yet God saith, Levit. 20. 3. *I will set my face against that man, and will cut him off from among his people.* The priests of Baal, who *cut themselves after their manner with knives, and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them*, 1. King. 18. 28. did they not follow the ill guide of a misled conscience? did they not think they were in the right? do not millions of Turks, Jews, and of Pagans go to the Devil, though they perswade themselves they be in the onely true way? do not many think that to be constancie, which in truth is obstinacie? and that to be knowledge, which is ignorant self-love? There is great resemblance, and manifold likelyhood between some truth and some errour, and the mistake is easie, and there is a great difference between opinion and sound belief. Thirdly, I would endeavour to think humbly of my self; and, as the Apostle adviseth, to preferre others before me. I would ruminate on that which the Apostle saith, 1. Cor. 13. 3. *Though I give my bodie to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.* And, shewing what he meaneth by *charity*, addeth, *Charity suffereth long, and is kinde: charity envieth not: charity is not rash*, or, *vaunteth not it self: is not puffed up, doth not behave it self unseemly.* So that he who behaveth himself unseemly, who is puffed up, who vaunteth himself, or is rash, who envieth, and is unkinde, and hasty, hath not charity. And, *though he give his bodie to be burned, his doing profiteth him nothing*, saith the Apostle. Examine therefore, and again I say, examine thine own heart: if thou findest any one of these sinnes before-named reigning in thee, then know there is a spot in the sacrifice. And till that be washed away, rased out, reformed, thou must suspect thy self, and mistrust well be dubious. Self-conceit is a branch of pride: pride never agreed with charity; and no doubt profiteth us any thing what doth not charity.

Obj. but this enfeebleth the resolution of confessors, and stoopeth down the constancy of martyrs to pendulous fear, it maketh them draw their hands back from the plough, and to look backward to Sodom, with Lots wife. No no, my discursive intends only to pull the edge of singularity, to stop the mouths of pride and stoutness, and bid men learn, to put a bridle into the teeth of such as rove at all adventures, to reduce people to sobriety, and such thoughts as these, *if mine weigh not deeds*

how much easier may I erre? If the more learned be erring, how shall I be sure I am right? They have soules to answer, as well as I: and charity bids me think, they would not damn their own soules by damning mine. How I alone a sound rectified conscience? Self-deniall is a better schoolmaster to true knowledge, then presumption. An acceptable martyr is a reasonable sacrifice, and an acceptable sacrifice is a reasonable martyr. A conscience not founded on good causes, not strengthened with understanding, is like a fair house built on the sands, a very apple of Sodom, *a painted sepulchre, which appeares beautifull outward, but is within full of dead mens bones, and of all uncleannesse.* Matth. 23. 27. My cautions are not remeares, of staying or withdrawing any man, so farre as his knowledge can or doth aspire unto; (for so farre I allow them a judgement of discretion) but necessary preparatives to the true, perfect, and glorious martyrdome. He shall be no martyr in my estimate, who without great motives runneth to death, and posteth rashly to destruction. But when pride with all her children, singularity, self-love, vaunting, rashnesse, unseemly behaviour, is cast out of the soule, and the contrary graces, the children of charitie, possesse it: then, if thy conscience can no way be convicted, if thou knowest thy cause to be good, and the contrary to be apparently amisse, follow not the multitude, conform not thy self to the world, keep thy conscience untainted, poure out thy bloud unto death, offer thy life and body as a reasonable sacrifice, die, and be a martyr; be a martyr, and be crowned, crowned, I say, not onely with glory and immortality, but with those gifts and *aureolæ*, which are prepared above others for true martyrs. In this sort, *Whosoever shall confesse Christ before men, him will Christ confesse also before his Father which is in heaven.* Matth. 10. 32.

The judgement of jurisdiction, which is in superiours having authoritie, and the judgement of direction, which is in Pastours by way of eminency, forbid not in this case the judgement of discretion, which is and ought to be in every private man, so farre as he hath discretion and knowledge or immediate inspirations of all which I would not have a man too presumptuous.

That which our Divines do term *the judgement of discretion*, is, in the words of Tertullian, *Charitatis arbitrium*. He mustne ver contrary this, for his must be the will which he knoweth, of him as a good witnesse of truth his bloud will need bee. But in things beyond a simple mans capacitie, I will say once more with S. Augustine *of faithfull signatures*, *to have then a sober knowledge*. In such things it be, that we look to his Pastours: for the calle things any man may judge of in the more obscure, the voice of the Pastours is to be followed. Where knowledge

a Contra Marcionem 4. post medium pag. 269.

a Serm. 20. de verbis Apostoli.

b *Melior est fidelis ignorantia quàm temeraria scientia.*

c *Quam clavem habebant Legis Doctores, nisi interpretationem legis?*

Doctours of the law, (saith Tertullian in the same place) *but the interpretation of the law?* So *the key of interpretation* rests in the ministery, for things which need interpretation, as hard places do; though *the key of agnition*, in things unto which their knowledge can aspire, is permitted, yea, commended unto all men: and they who withhold this *key of knowledge* from the people, are accursed by Christ, Luke 11. 52.

To the further explaining of my opinion, let us consider, in a Church corrupted, these two sorts of people. First, the Magistrates, either Civil or Ecclesiastical: And we will subdivide them into the Wilfully blinde, and the Purblinde.

Of the first were some Bishops, and Nobles, and Gentry in Queen Maries dayes, who hunted after bloud, even the bloud of innocents, and strained their authority to the highest. Such is now the Inquisition, falsly called *the holy house*, with all the chief officers thereof: such in the dayes of Christ, were divers Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and some Rulers of the people, who knowing the truth to be on Christs side, by his doing such miracles as no man ever did before, did choke and strangle their belief, made shipwrack of their consciences, resisted the holy Spirit, who would *neither go into the kingdome of heaven, nor suffer others that were entring, to go in.* against whom Christ pronounced *woe* upon *woe*, Matth. 23. 13. &c. For *they took away the key of knowledge*, Luke 11. 52. and purposely kept the people ignorant and blinde. According to their demerits, there are reserved for them *imma inferni*, *the depths of hell*; blacknesse of darknesse, and the greatest torments thereof, without repentance.

The next tribe, or sort, are the purblinde Magistracy, either Secular, or Clergy. Such were divers in the dayes of Queen Mary, who had learning enough, to know that all went not right, yet did not vehemently oppose the truth, but did swimme with the stream, & made the time their Item: the whole Church turning and returning three or foure times in one age. These were seduced, as well as seducers. Such also at this day are divers in the Papacy; more moderate, lesse rigid and rigorous, concealing some truths they know, because they have given up their hearts and beliefs to trust in their Church, for such things as they do not know; though they have means to learn, and capacitie to understand, if they would, and therefore are faulty. Such also were divers in the Jewish Church and State. *Ye killed the Prince of life*, saith S. Peter to the people, Acts 3. 15. *And now brethren, I know that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers.* Such were those Pharisees, Matth. 15. 12. who *were offended* with Christ, of whom Christ saith, vers. 14. *They be blinde leaders of the blinde. And if the blinde lead the blinde, both shall fall into the ditch.* Into the *lake of fire and hell*, saith Hugo Cardinalis, on the

d *In foveam præcipitii & inferni.*

the place. *When the shepherd goes by craggie cliffs, the flock must needs fall headlong, and break their necks*, saith Gregory. *The guides are the teachers; and the ditch is hell*, saith Fabius Stapulensis, on the place. So much of the purulent Magistracy, Clericall or Laicall, in a corrupted Church.

From the Magistrates in the first place, we descend to the people in the second place, whom we also divide into their severall ranks and files.

In the generall, they are either learned or unlearned. The learned are first such, as go against their conscience, and practise contrary to their knowledge and belief, sailing with winde and tide: and because they will be found faults with all by the fewest, they will do as the most do. Timorous hypocrites they are; fearing persecution, losse of goods, liberty, and life, more then they fear God, who is able to destroy both body and soul: for whom is kept the allotment of hypocrites, brimstone and fire, storm and tempest, *ignis & vermis*: this shall be their portion to drink, without repentance.

An other sort of learned men professing truth, these are in a corrupted Church, and each of them (forsooth) will be a reformer of the publick: these *despise government, are presumptuous, self-willed, they are not afraid to bring railing accusations, speaking evil of the things that they understand not*, verse 12. (as out of question they understand not all things, which in their carping humour they censure:) people-pleasers, ambitious of esteem, full of words, running as much after their own will as after their consciences, hearty enough to draw on danger, obstinate enough to provoke death. Of these men, though they die for some truths, yet because they have a mixture of many errours in their intellect, perverseness in their will, and ill grounded, ill bounded affections, wanting those godly endowments of charity before spoken of, we may pronounce, as the Apostle did, *They shall utterly perish in their own corruption*, 2. Pet. 2. 12. Such a fellow was he, and his like, of whom [a] Mr. Fox reporteth, that when Christ said, *This is my body*, interpreted the words to this effect, *The word of God is to be broken, distributed, and eaten*. So when Christ said, *This is my blood*: the blessed words are misunderstood, as if Christ had then said, *The Scripture must be given to the people, and received by them*: by which forced exposition, the seal of our redemption is trodden under foot, the thrice-blessed sacrament of the bodie and blood of our Lord is utterly annihilated, whereas indeed, in the words of consecration, there are included *verba fundamentalia & mediandi, words predicatorie and forming the doctrine*. I will not esteem him an holy perfect martyr, who dies with such crotchets in his brain, such pride in his heart. Such an one was Ravaillac, who for conscience sake (forsooth) stabbed the Anointed

[a] Cùm pastor per abrupta gradatur, necesse est ut grex in præcipitium ducatur.

[a] Duces, præceptores fœces, inferum.

ointed of the Lord, the Heros of our time, his naturall Soveraigne, Henry the fourth of France. He followed his conscience; but his conscience had ill guides. When he had outfaced tortures, and death it self (though he thought that he died a martyr) if he died unrepentant, the powers of hell got hold upon him.

Such manner of people were those Jews, who in most desperate fashion said, *His blood be on us, and on our children*, Matt. 27. 25. Do you think they all were wholly ignorant? do you think, they all swerved against their consciences? or rather, medled they not in things above their callings? were they not too presumptuous? Thus, though they had the knowledge of some truths, and perhaps would have died for them; yet their zeal wanted more and better knowledge, to have rectified their consciences: and they should have called to minde the miracles of Christ, and born witnesse to his innocency, rather then to set themselves forward in things beyond their reach and knowledge.

[h] Lib. 8. cap. 19.

Philip de [h] Commines telleth of two Franciscans, who offered themselves to the fire, to prove Savanorola to be an heretick, and not to have had revelations divine: and another Frier, a Jacobin, presented himself also to the fire, to uphold Savanorola, though Savanorola did not then expose himself to that purgation by fire. Which intendments of theirs seem rather to be the fruits of evil then of Christian fortitude. For, [i] *The mother of martyrdome is the Catholick faith, to which those famous champions have subscribed with their blood*, saith Aquin, out of Maximus. But those bravadoes of the Friers savoured of the transalpine and cisalpine factions; some inclining to the French king, with his adherents, the other to the Pope and Venetians, and their partakers.

[i] *Mater martyrii est fides Catholica, in qua illustres Athletæ sanguine suo subscripserunt.*

Some drew death upon them, when they needed not, in the Primitive Church, and the holy Fathers, and Councels, have disliked them for it. The Eliberine Councel, chap. 60. [k] *If any one break idols, and be killed in the act, we think it not fit that he be received into the number of martyrs, because for his so doing he had neither warrant of Scripture, nor example of the Apostles.* The Circumcellions thrust themselves into the mouth of dangers: ambitious of martyrdome to that height of infatuation, that if no body would kill them, they would murder and massacre themselves.

[k] *Si quis idola fregerit, & ibidem fuerit occisus; quia in Evangelio non est scriptum, neque invenitur ab Apostolis unquam factum, placuit in numerum eum non recipi martyrum.*

There were also certain women, who to keep their chastity hastened their own deaths, *Sophonia killed her self, lest the Emperour Maximinus should abuse her*, saith Eusebius. Pelagia flung her self headlong into a river, lest a Souldier should violate her. Such things ought not to be done, and are sinfull, and unlawfull to be done. And yet because the Church hath accounted

them

them martyrs, we must conclude that the Church did think they had divine inspirations directly animating them to that course, as Samson had in the Old Testament. [1] *When God commands, and plainly intimates that it is his command, who can blame him that obeyeth?* saith S. Augustine.

Aquinas 2. 2. Quæst. 124. Artic. 1. in the third objection, hath these words, [2] *It is not commendable for a man to offer himself to martyrdome, but seems rather to be presumptuous and dangerous.* And in the answer he intimateth, That a man ought not to seek death; and saith expresly, [3] *A man ought not to give occasion of doing unjustly: but if another do unjustly, he ought to endure it patiently.*

The third and last sort of learned men, in a Church and State full of errours, are thus qualified;

They are pious towards God, charitable towards men, zealous, according to their knowledge, knowing so much as they can well learn, mourners for sick and dead in Sion, signing their cheeks with teares for the backsliding of the people, having *cornea genua*, knees hardned like horn by their frequent bendings at prayers, that God would shew mercy to the misguided; singing to God in their hearts, when danger stoppeth their mouths; not petulant, or immodest against the Magistrates; no prompt, proterve undertakers; no railers, censurers, or rash damners of others; no factionists, or disturbers of Commonweals; avoiding the storms of persecution, so farre as conveniently and conscionably they may, *keeping the unity of truth*, as much as is possible, *in the bond of peace*; thus farre flexible and pliable, that they would willingly exchange any old errour (if such be settled in them) for apparent truth; thus farre constant and irremoveable, that they preferre the naked truth above their lives, and can in all humblenesse and patience write the confession of their faith with their own bloud. Such a life may I live, such a death may I die: greater glory then such shall have, I desire not. This is the true character of a martyr, so perfect as usually flesh and bloud affords.

The last point concerneth unlearned men, who live in a defiled Church. Shall these be ruled by their Pastours, leaving the dictates of their own consciences, unpractised, unbelieved? I answer, There is not the simplest of the people, to whom I will denie a judgement of discretion, which he is bound to follow, even unto death, according to his conscience. And among the unlearned, there are some of excellent wits, quick capacities, and some endowments, both of nature and grace, surpassing divers learned men. I counsel every one of these to take this advice from me; let them learn to be *Christs fatned, transformable to Christ*, (which is a point that this godly and learned Cardinall Cusanus often and excellently inculcateth,) and let them

[1] *Cùm Deus jubet, sèu jubere sine ullis ambagibus intimat; quis obedientiam in crimen vocet?*

[2] De Civit. 1.26.

[2] *Non est laudabile quòd aliquis martyrio se ingerat, sed magis videtur esse præsumptuosum & periculosum.*

[3] *Non debet homo occasionem dare alteri injustè agendi: sed si alius injustè egerit; ipse moderatè tolerare debet.*

them labour to be every way equall to that famous martyr, whom immediatly before I characterized and described. By how much the lesse they have of knowledge, let them have the more of humilitie and conformablenesse. Lastly, let them ponder, how mercifull the Lord is to such as sinne of ignorance: and on the contrarie, that not onely divers of the unlearned, but such as have had a fair competency of knowledge, have been transported with self-love, and treading out paths of singularity, have runne headlong into damnation. Witnesse divers Arians, burnt in the dayes of Queen Elisabeth: witnesse Hacket, seduced by the Devil under a shew of long, extemporary prayers, and extraordinary holinesse; till at the end he grew blasphemous, and in the heat of it died. Let him think of Sir John Oldcastle, who intimated, not onely a possibility, but a likelihood of his *rising again the third day after his hanging and burning*, if Stows chronicles had sufficient ground to write to that effect. If I should repeat the like monsters in other Churches and Commonwealths, I might much more enlarge this discourse, which is too long already. I conclude: The simple unlearned good man, who is bound up in invincible ignorance, and is misled by his Pastours, to whose guidance he hath subjected his conscience, is lesse sinfull, by many degrees, then he who casteth himself violently, singularly, and proudly, into the same errours, or as bad. And if it be dangerous to take from the people their discerning power, in any cause, as some imagine, let them ponder, whether it be not more dangerous, to let every one of them to runne loose, like the unbridled Circumcellions, to choose their own wayes, (which is the guise of Separatists) and to be their own judges, and judges of whatsoever their Pastours preach, (which is the practice of ill taught zelots in our Church) and by necessary consequence, judges of things of Faith, of Controversies, and of Scripture it self: And so the supreamest Tribunall, for interpretation of matters religious, to be the conscience of an unlearned brain. But thou, O Man of God, flee these extreams; and, O blessed God and man, O Saviour of mankinde, Jesu Christ, keep us in the mean, and bring us by holinesse to the truth, and by thy truth unto thy glory. So be it, Lord Jesu, so be it.

The word of God is a sea, saith [p] S. Ambrose, *having in it deep senses, and heights of prophetical riddles*. But in these dayes of Libertinisme the simplest presume, they can sound these deeps, and finde out the riddle, though they plow not with Samsons heifer. Hence are these innumerable springs of errours, which Luther, even in his own time, seeing to overflow Germany, in his first book against Zwinglius and Oecolampadius, saith, *If the world continue, it will be again necessary, by reason of the divers interpretations of Scripture that now are, if we will keep the unity of the faith,*

[p] Epist. 44. ad Constantinum.

faith, that we receive the decrees of Councels, and flee to them. The place of Auguſtine is common, and in every mans mouth, [1] *I would not beleeve the Goſpel, unleſſe the authority of the Catholick Church moved me.* How ſhould we know, that ſuch and ſuch things are Scripture, and not ſuch or ſuch, but by the Church, as by the firſt introductary means? or why ſhould not the unlearned people as well truſt their Paſtours for the expoſition of Scripture, as they have done, and do, and muſt do for the tranſlation? For be ye not deceived, O over-inſpired brethren; neither Moſes, nor the Prophets, nor Chriſt, nor the Evangeliſts or Apoſtles ever wrote or penned your Engliſh Scripture. They wrote in Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriack, and Greek: but they were your Paſtours, who tranſlated the word of God into our mother tongue; and ſome tranſlations are more imperfect then other, and no one abſolutely perfect. And will you, ſilly ignaroes, who cannot know whether the words be true or falſe, well or ill tranſlated, be every one of you your judges of the meaning thereof, (which in deep points is harder then tranſlating) and uſurp the power of interpretation? I may take up the complaint of Michael Piccart, in his epigram before Balthaſar Bambach his tractates,

Et tractare quidem quiſnam eſt qui ſacra vereatur?
Imberbes pueri jam quoque ſacra crepant.

But I am loath to adde, as he doth,

O pecus Arcadicum, linguas prius imbibe ſanctas,
Et ſacra ex ipſo fonte deinde pete.

Yea, I have an intent to have a bout with the learned Daniel Heinſius, for maintaining in the preface to his *Ariſtarchus Sacer* upon Nonnus, *That no man can rightly interpret the Scriptures, but he that is skilled in Eaſtern languages; Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriack, and Greek both ſacred and profane, Helleniſtical and the pure,* which is all one in effect with the Jewiſh-Greek, and the Heathen-Greek. Some of his words, pag. 53. are theſe, [2] *It is very materiall to know, whether it be Hebrew or Syriack which the Helleniſt expreſſeth in Greek: alſo, whether he hath reſpect to the Hebrew Text, or to the Greek tranſlations of it. All which unleſſe the expoſitour diſtinctly conſidereth, he muſt needs loſe his labour. And we think him to be a man as of little skill, ſo of no conſcience, that dares tranſlate the Scriptures without any conſideration of theſe things.*

Both theſe were eminent profeſſours, and men ſingular among thouſands; the firſt in High-Germany, the other in the Netherlands; from whence ſome of them brag, and ſome of us rejoyce that we have received the reformation of religion. I will onely humbly propound to your religious conſiderations theſe things:

Firſt, that the difficulties of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Aramean languages in the Old Teſtament, and of the Greek in

[1] *Ego Evangelio non crederem, niſi me Eccleſiæ Catholicæ authoritas commoveret.*

[2] *Multum refert ſcire, Hebræa Helleniſtes Græcè expreſſerit, an Syra: Hebræum item textum, an interpretationes reſpiciat Græcorum. Quæ niſi omnia diſtinguat, operam neceſſe eſt interpres ludat. Nos autem, ut exigua ſcientia, ita nullius, ut loquuntur vulgò, conſcientiæ exiſtimamus, qui tranſferre Sacra audet, nec de iſtis cogitavit.*

in the New, eſpecially where it reflecteth up to the Syriack, are above common capacities, even of the learned. I might adde, that words of divers other languages are part of the ſacred Text. The Egyptian *Abrech*, Geneſ. 41.43. the Arabick *Lehhem*, Job 6.7. and *Tetaphoth*, Exod. 13.16. a compound of Egyptian and African languages, and the like. Yea one verſe, and one onely was written by Jeremy in the Chaldee language, *viz.* Jeremy 10.11. which every captive Jew was commanded to caſt in the teeth of the Babylonians. Moreover Daniel 5. 25. *Mene Mene, Tekel Upharſin*, was written in the Chaldee, with the Samaritan letters: ſo that the Chaldeans themſelves could not reade their own language. I would tell you of ▭ finall being placed in the middle of a word of the Text, and of divers other difficulties, which in part I paſſe over, and in part thus contract, in the obſervations following.

Secondly, that Hebrew words without points may have foure or five ſignifications, according to the diverſity of vowels affixed to them; and have no certain meaning, but as it is guided by antecedents and conſequents. And yet you ſhall have an ignorant mechanick, or talkative woman, as confident of the Genevean Tranſlation and notes, as if God himſelf did ſpeak or write the ſame words, as he did once the law on Horeb.

Thirdly, that in the Hebrew many words are written with fewer letters, then they are pronounced.

Fourthly, that many are written with more letters, then they are pronounced.

Fifthly, that divers words are written in the ſacred Text, which are not pronounced at all, but others are read in their ſtead. [t] *There are eight words written in the Text, but not read, which the Maſora alledgeth*, Ruth 3. 12.

[t] *Sunt octo voces quæ ſcriptæ ſunt in Textu, ſed non legnntur, quas adducit Maſora*, Ruth 3. 12.

Sixthly, that the Jews have moſt ſeverely and ſtrictly forbidden, that any Rabbin ſhould teach Chriſtians the true ſenſe of the Talmuds; which (as they boaſt) no labour and endeavour can attain unto without ſuch a guide. Elias Levita in Maſoreth-Hammaſſoreth, complaineth, that the Jews were wonderfully offended with him, becauſe he inſtructed Chriſtians in the Hebrew. And though ſome tax him for ſinging *placentia*, to ſooth & flatter his patron Ægidius; and call him a turn-coat, becauſe he came forth of the Jewiſh ſynagogue to pray with us in our temples: yet that odious name ought to have been ſpared, unleſſe he kept ſtill a Jewiſh heart within him; which certainly he did, if Balthaſar Bambach ſaith truly of him, [u] *He concealed the chief myſteries, and revealed nothing of their ſecrets.*

[u] *Præcipua myſteria retinuit, & nihil arcani revelavit.*

Seventhly, that many Hebrew Radixes do ſignifie not onely things wonderfully diſparat, and incompatible the one with the other, (as *Sheol* ſignifieth the *grave* in ſome places, and *hell* in other places:) which cauſed ſome to deny Chriſts deſcent in his humane

fountaine, soul into hell;) but even things cleane contrary. This instance (as the former) shall be in a word generally known. Iob 2.9. his wife saith unto him, [illegible], *Curse God*; others render it, *Blesse God*. None hitherto hath infallibly expounded it. Yet my faith *can swallow camels, & strain at gnats*, that is, buildeth upon the Translation made by the Ministers, though the ground hath been slippery and full of ice; but will (forsooth) be judge of the meaning, when he understandeth not the words: as if one unskilfull in the Dutch language should say, when he heard a German speak; *I know his meaning by his gaping, or by the sound of his words, or by the gargarisme of his throat-speech.*

Though the Apostle saith, 1. Thessal. 5.21. *Prove all things, hold fast that which is good*; yet he speaketh of the spirits of private men, or misperswasions of the false Apostles; who presumed very much, and knew very little. These are to be tried. But concerning the decrees of the Church, the same Apostle doth not say, Prove them, examine them, vie them, judge them: but Acts 16.4. Paul and other Ministers, *as they went through the cities, delivered them the decrees for to keep*, (or observe) *that were ordained of the Apostles and Elders which were at Jerusalem. And so* (or by this meanes of keeping, or observation) *were the Churches established in the faith*, &c. verse 5. But (saith the fantick Libertine) I am a man spirituall: *But he that is spirituall, judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man*, 1. Corinth. 2.15. I answer, S. Paul speaketh of the Apostles, who had the Spirit of God, verf. 12. and spake in words which the holy Ghost taught, verf. 13. and who might well neglect the judgement of men, 1. Corinth. 3.3. Prove thou thy Apostleship by such undeniable miracles and testimonies, as they did; and thou shalt judge, and not be judged. But that every idiot should claim the priviledge of an Apostle, is lewd divinity, or rather insufferable pride. The Angel in the Church of Thyatira is censured, Revel. 2.20. *because he suffered that woman Jezebel, which called her self a Prophetesse, to teach and seduce Gods servants.* If the profoundest Divines on earth, unexperienced in worldly courses, should teach the skilfullest tradesmen their trades, or manufactures, and meddle in their crafts (as they call them;) would they not expose themselves to laughter and mocking? is not the proverb of the world too true, *The greatest Clerks are not the wisest men, if you take them from their books?* Are there more depths in trades, then in the Word of God? Or shall tradesmen, and women judge of the depths of Divinity; and the learned Divines in their own profession be not believed, but laught at, controlled, and censured by the private spirit of unlearned people? Are not the spirits of the Prophets subject to the Prophets? Very learned men scarce trust to themselves. A Physician that is very sick, seeks counsel of an other who is whole, and dares not trust his own

judgement: and shall a soul sick of sinne, sick of errour, sick of scruples, be its own helper? shall it understand without a guide? be cleansed of its leprosie without a Priest? Hieromein his Preface to the Cõmentary upon the epistle to the Eph. thus. *From my youth I never ceased to reade, or to ask of learned men what I knew not; I never was mine own Master, or taught my self: and of late I journyed purposely to Alexandria, unto Didymus, that he might satisfie me in all the doubts which I had found in the Scripture.* Now adayes many a one is wiser then his Teachers; not by supernall illumination, but by infernall presumption. And if they have gotten by rote the letter of Scripture, and can readily cite *sweneta & memonia*, the chapter and the verse, (though they have little more judgement then Cardinall Ascanius his parret, which would prate the Creed all over) they vilifie the opinions of the most learned, and their private spirit of seduction will beare them out.

[u] Lib. 11. cap. 9.

[u] Ruffinus saith thus of Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, *They were both noblemen, both students at Athens, both colleagues for thirteen yeares together, all prophane learning removed, studied on the holy Scriptures, & followed the sense, not taken from their own presumption, but from the writings and authority of the ancients, which ancients, it appeared, took the rule of right understanding the Scripture, from Apostolick succession.* S. Basil himself saith of himself and others, in his Epistle to the Church of Antioch, *As for us, we do not take our faith upon trust from other later men, nor dare we deliver to others the conceits of our own brains, lest mens devices should be thought to be articles of Religion: but what we have been taught of the holy Fathers, that we declare to those that ask of us.* How often doth the divine S. Augustine confirm his interpretations by the authority of Cyprian, Ambrose, and other preceding Fathers? How often doth he confesse his own ignorance, though he was the most accõplished that ever writ since the dayes of the Apostles? It was a wise observation of Scaliger, *That some words and passages in Plato [y] are wiser then their author:* and many excellent conceits are collected from Homer and Aristotle, which they never dreamed of. But in the Word of God it is contrary. The Spirit was, and is infinite that did dictate it: the finite capacity of man cannot comprehend it: whatsoever good interpretation we finde, may well be thought to be the meaning of the Spirit: and yet the Spirit may, and doth mean many things, which the wit of any man could never disclose. And the true literal sense is the hardest to finde.

[x] τὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας διανοίας γεννήματα παραδιδόναι οὐ τολμῶμεν.

[y] Plus sapiunt authore.

I confesse I have dwelt too long on this point; but it is to vindicate the authority of our Church from the singular fancies of private unskilfull, unlearned, and censorious men and women, and to shew the madnes of those base people-pleasers or *publicolæ*, who make, or esteem tradesmen, and youth, and ill-nurtured, unlettered idiots (yea though their places be eminent) the competent judges of controversies; whilest they flee from the

chairs

chairs of the Universities, and from the representative Church of our kingdome, *viz.* the most learned Bishops, and Convocation-house; unto whom they ought to have recourse, and in whose judgement they are, by way of obedience, without opposition to set up their rest. For as for private immediately divine, and infallible revelation, there is none at all; or, if any be, it is in some of those learned ones, who are lawfully called to be the members of our Church representative. And if any defects be in learned men, there are more in unlearned. But of this point otherwhere.

8 Another observation there is, *That kings and supream officers do represent the people committed to their charge.* And here I will tell you, in honour of the Royall Majesty, what Flavius Josephus saith, *We offer daily sacrifices for the Emperours, and that not onely on ordinary dayes of the common vow of all the Jews, but also when we offer no other sacrifices of the common charge, yea not for our children. We give this high honour to the Emperours onely, which we do not give to any other man.* This he saith they practised in the behalf of heathen Emperours, different from them in Religion: how much more ought we, by all lawfull means, exceed them in the honouring of our Kings?

[a] Lib. 2. contra Apionem.

Espencæus calleth a Prince *columbam Dei*, *Gods dove*: Saul is termed *the beauty of Israel*, 2. Sam. 1. 19. David is styled *the light, candle, or lamp of Israel*, 2. Sam. 21. 17. Josiah was *the breath of our nostrils*, saith Jeremy, Lament. 4. 20. Are not these two latter phrases ideall? are their persons, themselves onely? Again, is not Saul called *the head of the Tribes of Israel*? 1. Sam. 15. 17. and David *the head over Nations*? 2. Sam. 22. 44. Chrysostom intituled Theodosius, *The head and supream over all men on earth.* And therefore, as the people reap benefits extraordinary by their Kings; (for *Saul clothed you in scarlet, with other delights; he put on ornaments of gold upon your apparell*, saith David, 2. Sam. 1. 24.) so for their Kings offences they justly may be punished, 2. Sam. 24. 17. *Lo, I have sinned* (saith David) *but these sheep, what have they done?* Yet the pestilence, worse then the basest rot, fell upon those sheep.

[b] Hom. 2. ad popul. Antioch.

Αντος ἀμὸς ἐσσεται ἠδὲ καὶ ἄλλοις
Νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὦκα κακὴν ὀλέκουσα δὲ λαοὺς

that is,

Apollo being incensed against the King Agamemnon, sent an evill disease upon his army, and the people perished. The story is memorable, of Saul, 1. Sam. 14. 24, &c. He took a foolish and rash oath, hurtfull to his own souldiers, profitable for the enemy. Neither Jonathan, nor the Captains, nor the people did sweare with him, but in him, and by him, and through his oath: yet it bound both the people and himself, yea tied afterwards Jonathan,

who heard it not, and knew it not, as those who were present, and heard it: for the lot from God drew Jonathan out, as faulty, and punishable for his fathers adjuration, who sware expresly, by name, the death of Jonathan (if he were faulty) vers. 39. yet the love of the people delivered him; and (as I think) the father did not much care to break his oath. In this fact Sauls person represented the whole army, and the people, for their own particular, held themselves wrapped up to obedience in his oath.

But what do I instance in slighter matters, when a proof is pregnant, *That the chief governours oaths binde the whole nation & their posterity for ever more, while their Polity lasted?* Joshua unadvisedly, without counselling with God, *made peace and league with the Gibeonites*; (the descendants of Canaan, that *servant of servants*) *to let them live* in the lowest rank of slaves; *and the Princes of the congregation sware unto them*, Josh. 9. 15. And though *all the congregation murmured against the Princes*, vers. 18. (from whence I conclude, that the people consented not to the treaty, much lesse were sworn to it) yet the Princes resolved justly and conscionably, *We have sworn unto them by the Lord God of Israel: now therefore we may not touch them*, vers. 19. And vers. 20. thus, *We will even let them live, lest wrath be upon us, because of the oath which we sware unto them.* And accordingly Joshua freed them from the intended slaughter of the angry Israelites, vers. 26. That this oath concerned not the people then living onely, but reached also unto posterity, is apparent, 2. Sam. 21. 1, &c. When for the breach of this oath, committed about foure hundred yeares after, the Lord himself taxeth *Saul and his bloudy house, because he slew the Gibeonites*; and therefore sent purposely a triennial famine upon the land, and Gods wrath was not satisfied, till the Gibeonites were appeased by the death of Sauls posterity. And these 5 things are yet observable. First, Saul sought to slay the Gibeonites, *in his zeal to the children of Israel and Judah*, v. 2. Secondly, *God commanded Moses to destroy all the inhabitants of the land*, whereof the Gibeonites were part, as they themselves confessed, Josh. 9. 24. Thirdly, what was the oath of the Princes onely, is said to be the oath of the children of Israel, (as it is, 2. Sam. 21. 2.) because it concerned them for ever. Fourthly, after the punishment, for this cause inflicted, *God was intreated for the Land*. Fifthly, it was about foure hundred yeares after the oath of Joshua and the Princes, when God thus severely vindicated the breach thereof by Saul upon Sauls posterity.

9 Lastly, let us diligently consider how much Christ Jesus our blessed Saviour hath done for us, representing as it were our persons, and what we perform and shall obtain in him, and by him.

Isa. 53. 4. *Surely he hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows:* which is applied to him, Matth. 8. 19. The force of which

words is expressed by the Apostle, 1 Peter 2. 24. *Christ his owne self bare our sinnes in his owne body on the tree,* (or, *to the tree*, but so *him*) *and by his stripes ye were healed.* S. Paul saith, *Christ died for our sinnes*, 1. Corinth. 15. 3. *Christ tasted death for every man*, Heb. 2. 9. *Christ died for us*, Rom. 5. 8. And in the next verse, *We be justified by his bloud, and We shall be saved from wrath by him. He hath blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary unto us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his crosse*, Coloss. 2. 14. And, *By him God hath made peace through the bloud of his crosse, and reconciled all things unto himself by Christ*, Coloss. 1. vers. 20. *He hath reconciled you in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable, and unreprovable in his sight*, vers. 22. *He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification*, Rom. 4. 25. *Ye are buried with him in baptisme, wherein also ye are risen with him: and you being dead he hath quickned with him*, as it is most divinely expressed, Coloss. 2. 12. 13. *In Christ we are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit*, Ephes. 2. 22. *Our life is hid with Christ in God*, Coloss. 3. 3. And in the verse following, *Christ is our life. Ye be risen with Christ*, Coloss. 3. 1. *God hath quickned us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus*, Ephes. 2. 5, 6. *Our conversation is in heaven*, Philip. 3. 20. From which positive proofs, and doctrine, that Christ stood in our stead, and that almost all (if not all) his actions and passions, as he was the Mediatour between God and man, were representative of us; let us descend to the comparative, and shew, that Christ hath done, and will do more good unto us, then Adam hath done harm. Which point I have more enlarged in my Sermon (at the re-admitting into our Church, of a penitent Christian from Turcisme) being one of the two, intituled, *A return from Argier*: where these five reasons are enlarged. First, that Adam conveyed to us onely one sinne: but Christ giveth diversities of grace, and many vertues, which Adam and his posterity should never have had; as patience, virginity, repentance, compassion, fraternall correction, martyrdom. Secondly, Adams sinne was the sinne of a meer man onely: but the Sonne of God merited for us. Thirdly, by Adams offence we are likened to beasts; by the grace of Christ our nature is exalted above all Angels. Fourthly, Adams disobedience could not infect Christ: Christs merit cleansed Adam, saving his soul and body. Fifthly, as by the first Adam goodnes was destroyed; so by the second Adam greater goodnes is restored, and all punishments, yea all our own sinnes turned to our further good.

To which I will annex these things following. By Adams sinne we were easily separated from God: Satan, the woman, and an apple were the onely means: But *I am perswaded*, (saith the

the Apostle, Rom. 8.38. *that neither death, nor life, nor Angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God.* Again, Rom. 5.13, &c. the Apostle seeketh to divide the whole of time in this world, into three parts, under three laws; the law of Nature, of Moses, of Christ. In the first section of time, sinne was in the world: — *Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses*, saith the Apostle. In the law of Moses, though death was in the world, yet sinne chiefly reigned, and the rather for the law:

Metimur in vetitum semper, cupimusque negatum:

This the Apostle confirmeth often, especially Rom. 7. 8. *Sinne taking occasion, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence.* The third part of times division is in the dayes of grace, under Christ: and now, not so much death, not so much sinne, as righteousnes and life do reigne, or rather we in them, by Christ; and the power of both the other is diminished, and shall be wholly demolished.

If Adam hurt all mankinde one way or other, Christ hath helped all mankinde many wayes. In this life he giveth many blessings unto the reprobate; his sunne shineth on all, his rain falleth both upon good and bad: and I do not think, that there ever was the man, at least within the verge of the Church, but had at some time or other such a portion of Gods favour, and such sweet inspirations put into his heart, that, if he had not quenched by his naturall frowardnes the holy motions of the Spirit, God would have added more grace, even enough to have brought him to salvation. For *God is rich in mercy*, Ephes. 2.4. *The Father of mercies*, 2. Corinth. 1.3. *Thou lovest all things that are, and abhorrest nothing that thou hast made: for never wouldest thou have made any thing, if thou hadst hated it*, Wisd. 11.24. *What thou dost abhorre or hate, thou dost wish not to be; what thou dost make, thou dost desire it should be*, saith Holcot on the place. In our Common-prayer-book, toward the end of the Commination, this is the acknowledgement of our Church, *O mercifull God, which hast compassion of all men, and hatest nothing that thou hast made, which wouldest not the death of a sinner, but that he should rather turn from sinne, and be saved, &c.* God is intituled φιλόψυχος, *Amator animarum, A lover of souls*, Wisd. 11.26. Holcot on the place confirmeth it by Ezek. 18.4. *All souls are mine*, saith God. *Men commonly love the bodies*, saith Holcot, *but God the souls.* [b] *God loveth the souls; not onely, as if he did not love the bodies; but principally, because he hath fitted them for the eternall fruition of himself.* It is not the best applied distinction: for whose soever souls shall enjoy God, their bodies also shall, and that immortally for ever. If he had said, that God had loved humane souls *privilegialiter*, because man had nothing to do in their crea-

[b] *Amat Deus animas, non singulariter sic, quòd non corpora amet; sed privilegialiter, quia eas ad se in perpetuum fruendum præparavit.*

creation or preservation; he had spoken more to the purpose. Nor think I, that God forsaketh any, but such as forsake him: but, *Vaine and thoughts separate from God*, (Wisd. 1. 3. &c.) *For into a malicious soul wisdome shall not enter, nor dwell in the body that is subject unto sinne. For the holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without understanding.* Concerning the soules of infants, dying without the ordinary antidotes to originall sinne, baptisme and the pale of the Church; though they may most justly be condemned, yet who knoweth how easy their punishment may be, at least comparatively, as some imagine? For, that some drops of mercy may extraordinarily distill upon them, they cannot deny who say, *That the rebellious spirits of actually sinfull men and Angels, are punished citra cruciatum.* But to leave these speculations, I dare boldly affirm, that if there be any mitigation of tormentes in any of them, it is not without reference to Christ.

Moreover the redeeming of man was of more power, then the very creation: for this was performed by a calm *Fiat*; but the redemption was accomplished by the agony, passion, and death of the Sonne of God. [c] Augustine on those words, Iohn 14. 12. *Greater works then these shall he do*, saith thus, *It is a greater work, to make a wicked man just, then to create heaven and earth.* Therefore much more doth Christs merit surmount the fault of Adam.

In the first Adam we onely had *posse non peccare, posse non mori, A possibility of not sinning, a possibility of not dying*; (We should have been changed, though we had not died) *posse bonum non deserere, A possibility of not forsaking goodnesse*: and should, by his integrity and our endeavours, have attained, at the utmost, but *bene agere, & beatificari, To do well, and be blessed.* By Christ we have not onely remission of sinnes, and his righteousnes imputed, but rich grace, abundance of joy, and royall gifts; (*Not a more joyfull, but a more powerfull grace*, saith [d] Augustine) and we shall have *non posse peccare, non posse mori, An impossibility of sinning or dying*, An unchangeable and immortall life. *Non posse deserere bonum, vel adhærere malo, An impossibility of forsaking goodnesse, and cleaving to evil*; and not onely *beatitudinem & gloriam*, but *coronam gloriæ, Not onely blessednesse and glory, but a crown of glory*, τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον, *An immarcescible crown of glory*, 1. Peter 5. 4.

Lastly, if we go to the numbring of them that were hurt by Adam, and the number of those who receive benefit by Christ; the greatest number is on Christs side. I would be loath to say, what the [e] Franciscane preached publickly at the Councel of Trent, [f] *That they who had no knowledge of Christ, and yet had lived honestly, had obtained salvation:* Nor will I conclude with others, that Aristides, Cato, yea Julius Cæsar himself is saved;

[c] Aug. in Joan. Tractatu 72. post medium.

[d] *Non lætiorem, sed potentiorem gratiam.* Aug. de Corrept. & Gratia cap. 11.

[e] Apud Sleidan pag. 293.

[f] *Eos, qui nullam haberent Christi cognitionem, & aliqui vitam egissent honestè, salutem esse consecutos.*

though, according to the fertility of the Italian wits, divers of them have found quaint passages and conceits tending that way. Nay, in these dayes of presumption, (wherein, by all likelihood, a thousand surfet and perish in the hope of mercy, in comparison of one soul ship-wracked on the rock of despair) I am afraid to confirm what Coelius secundus Curio hath writ, in his books *de Amplitudine regni Christi*; or Marsilius Andreasius of Mantua, *de Amplitudine misericordiæ Christi*, before him, who maintaineth, *That farre more are saved by Christ, then are condemned.* For though Christ saith, Matth. 7. 13. *Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat:* and vers. 14. *Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that finde it:* and though divers other passages of Scripture (by *the little flock*, and *few labourers*, with the like phrases) seem to import the paucity of humane souls saved, in comparison of the many condemned: yet he restraineth all those places to the dayes of Christ, when indeed few beleeved, in respect of the unbeleevers: and the emphasis may accordingly be set upon that word YE; *Enter* YE. And, perhaps, the antithesis is observable, *Many there be which* GO *in to the wide gate, and broad way*; but it is not said, *Few* SHALL *goin at the narrow gate*; nor, *Few* SHALL *enter in*: but, *Few there* BE *that finde it.* And it may be expounded, *Few there be that finde it; by themselves*, or *by their own naturall power, without satisfaction divine.* But what they cannot finde without a guide, they may finde by a guide: and many may enter in at Christ the Doore, and many may walk in Christ the Way. *Where sin abounded, grace* may *much more abound. As by one mans disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one* may *many be made righteous.* Concerning which places, with the precedent verses, Rom. 5, we shall treat by and by. But I return to their answer, That respect was had to the primitive dayes of Christs Church; and, That we are to consider, that when Christ likened *the Kingdome of God to a grain of mustard seed, which waxed a great tree; and to leaven, which leavened the whole* lump, Luke 13. 18, &c. he spake not without reference to his own dayes, in which they were generally perswaded, (as the Papists are now) that many were easily saved in their Church: whereupon one wondering at Christs doctrine, of the hardly obtaining of heaven, and that by few, saith (Luke 13. 23.) *Lord, are there few that be saved?* And Christ answereth, not without respect to those times, *Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many will seek to enter in, and shall not be able:* because they sought awry, and refused the right way offered. Yet many might be saved, and more in after-times then at that present time; more by farre in the Church of Christ growing and increasing, then in the Church of the Jews,

Jews, waning and decreasing. Yea, at this present, though a diligent computer shall not finde much fault with me, for saying, that, if the world were divided, for places and people, into thirty parts, Nineteen thereof are Infidels, six of the Mahometane Religion, and five of the Christian, the Romane Church and the Reformed Churches making but one part of the five; (so that the Greek Churches may more brag of their Catholicisme, then the Romane; and the scabbed petite flock, and schismaticall parlour-full, yea scarce hand-full of Separatists of Amsterdam, may cease to claim themselves to be the onely Church, by their paucity, which the least number of the never-agreeing, and subdivided Brethren may appropriate to themselves; excluding by that argument all the Churches of the world besides, yea even their own fellow-schismaticks) yet this I will be bold to say, that many places of the Prophets in the old Testament, and many in the New, did and do foresignifie, that great abundance of men, women, and children of all nations, of all places, shall be saved by Christ; that there shall be (as it were) *Mundus hominum electorum, A world of elect men, a great multitude of men, which no man could number*, Rev. 7. 9.

Unto which number of humane souls, if we annex those *thousand thousands* of Angels, *and ten thousand times ten thousand*, Daniel 7. 10. even that innumerable host also, we may confidently averre, what Elisha said of the blessed Angels in another case, 2. Kings 6. 16. *They which be with us, are more then they that be with our enemies*, or, *more then our enemies*. More in number enjoy eternall life by Christ, then are condemned to eternall death by Adam. For though Christ be not a Mediatour of *redemption* unto the Angels; yet was he a Mediatour of *confirmation in grace*; and whatsoever blessings they did, or do, or shall enjoy, they had it for and by the merit of Christ foreseen. For *he is the head of the Church*, and they be but *members*; and all the vertue or happinesse in the body, or in any part of it, is derived from the head. *All things visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, were created by him, and for him*, Colos. 1. 16. *In him all fulnesse dwelleth*, vers. 19. *From him the whole body is fitly joyned together*, Ephes. 4. 16. *In him all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy Temple*, Ephes. 2. 21. *And of his fulnesse have all we received, and grace for grace*, John 1. 16. And not we alone, but the good Angels also were predestinated, created, confirmed, and glorified by his means, as Suarez well concludeth, in his Commentaries on the third part of Aquine his Summe, Tom. 1. pag. 656. I say, saith he, *that Christ merited for the Angels grace, and glory, which were given them for the merits of Christ foreseen*. So Aquinas, Cajetan, Albertus, Marsilius, Jacobus de Valentia, Melchior Flavius, Arboreus. And again, the same Suarez pag. 65: 8. *The Lord Christ hath*

[g] *Dico Christum meruisse Angelis gratiam, & gloriam, quæ illis data fuerat propter merita Christi prævisa.*
[h] *Sentent. 3. Distinct. 13. Artic. 1.*
[i] *In illud, Psal. 102.* BENEDICITE DOMINO OMNIA OPERA EIUS.
[k] *Lib de Regno Christi.*
[l] *Theosophia, 3. 13.*
[m] *Christus Dominus meruit sanctis Angelis omnia dona gratiæ, exceptis iis quæ ad remedium peccati pertinent: meruit iis electionem, prædestinationem, vocationem, auxilia omnia excitantia, adjuvantia, sufficientia, & efficacia; denique, omne meritum & augmentum gratiæ & gloriæ.*

hath merited for the holy Angels all gifts of grace, except those which belong to the remedy of sinne. He hath merited for them election, predestination, vocation, all means exciting, helping, sufficient, and effectuall: Lastly, all merit and increase of grace and glory. As *the precious ointment, upon the head of Aaron, ran down upon his beard, and thence descended to the skirts of his garments,* Psal. 133. 2. so all vertue distilleth from Christ the Head, upon every member of his Church, Angelicall, or Humane; Triumphant, or Militant: neither have they ought, but what they received, and from him onely. In brief, we have exchanged, and bartred our brasse for gold; [n] *We had perished, if we had not perished,* as Themistocles said of old. [o] *O happy fault, that hath obtained so great and excellent a Redeemer!* Christ hath done us more good, then Adam did himself or us hurt.

[n] *Periissemus, nisi periissemus.*
[o] *O felix culpa, quæ tantum & talem meruit Redemptorem!*

If these my humble private speculations, or rather relations of other mens opinions, give not satisfaction, I desire you to have recourse unto the Apostle, who hath put the first and second Adam into the balances; and behold, the first Adam is found too light. In which comparative, being like in the *genus*, and unlike in the *species*, (as Origen soundly and wittily observed) First let us see the ὁμοια, *the things wherein they are like.* Rom. 5. 12. *As by one man sinne entred into the world, and death by sinne:* the Apodosis is not expressed, but thus to be conceived, *So by one man grace came into the world, and life by grace.* See the same confirmed, v. 19, 20. Secondly, *As by one mans disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous.* The third thing wherein they were like, is set down in the 18. verse; of which hereafter.

Concerning the ἀνομοια, *the things wherein they differ*, they are set down in the 15 verse, and so downward: *Not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one, many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.* An other dissimilitude is in the 16 verse, *And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgement was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.* And verse 17, *If by one mans offence, death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousnesse, shall reigne in life by one, Jesus Christ.* After this, he returneth to the third point of their comparison (the ἀνομοια, *the things wherein they differ*, being involved in a Parenthesis) which indeed may seem at the first sight more strange, *Therefore as by the offence of one, judgement came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the righteousnes of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life*, vers. 18. But the true meaning is this, according to the way of S. Augustine: As none cometh to death, but by Adam; and none to Adam, but by death: so none cometh to life, but by Christ;

nor

not to Christ, but by life. Thus the free gift came on all as the offence came on all. As when we say, All entred into the house by one doore; it is not intended or included, that all that ever were, farre or nigh, came thither, into the house, but that no man entred into the house, save by the doore. So though the Apostle saith, *Omnes* in the application; he meaneth not, that all and every one are justified, but that all that are justified, are not otherwise justified then by Christ: and this is S. Augustines exposition against Julian the Pelagian, 6. 10. As if he had said, *Christ is the A and O, the beginning, means, and end. There is none other name by which we must be saved*, Acts 4. 12. *He perfecteth them for ever who are sanctified*, Hebr. 10. 14. *And they are Christs, and Christ is Gods*, 1. Cor. 3. 23. οὗτος γνώριμος ἐστι, *His mylove and delight*, said Ignatius. And I professe, I desire not heaven, or the blessednes of heaven without him, as I, undeserving, ill-deserving, poore I, hope to reigne in life by him onely, who giveth spirituall birth, life, and increase, till he bring us unto blessednesse; even all them who are saved, even the universality of the chosen in Christ. The limitation of the word *Omnis* is frequent in Scriptures; not comprehending generally, or universally every one in all, and all with every one; but being put for a great number, for many: Luke 6. 26. *Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you*: where *All* must not be rentered and stretched to its utmost extent; for all and every did never, do never, and never shall, speak well of them. So Acts 22. 15. *Thou shalt be witnesse unto all men*, saith Ananias to S. Paul: which was not accomplished, if *All* have no restraint. Again, Titus 2. 11. *The grace of God which bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men*: and yet there were then, and now are many, who never saw or knew that salutiferous or saving grace. So here you are to reduce the word *Omnes*, to *omnes sui*; *All that are in Christ*, saith the Glosse. Again, why may not *All* be as well taken for *Many* in this our 18 vers. as *Many* is taken for *All* in the 19 verse? where it is said, *By one mans disobedience many were made sinners*: when all and every one that descended ordinarily and naturally from Adam, sinned in him and by him, as is expressed, verse 12. and proved before, Genes. 17. 4. *Thou shalt be a father of many nations*; which is repeated word for word, Rom. 4. 17. and is thus varied, Genes. 22. 18. *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*: and this is confirmed, Galat. 3. 8. where *Many* and *All* differ not in sense and substance.

By *Omnes homines*, *All men*, you may understand *Humanum genus*, *Mankinde*; and because all mankinde must be distinguished into two sorts, goats and sheep; and considered according to two estates, fallen and repaired; and their different receptacles, the two cities; the one the city of God, the other of the Devil; in the first member the word *All* must be interpreted generally, without restriction; because in it was speech of Adam, by whom

whom death came upon all, without exception: but in the second and opposite member, *All* is not to be taken in the same amplitude; *sed juxta rem subjectam*, *But according to the subject spoken of*: *All that have grace, and the gift of righteousnesse*: *Omnes divisitandi*; *All that are to be made alive*, saith S. Augustine; *all that are Christs*.

So much in defence of those who by *All* understand *genera singulorum*, but not *singula generum*, *Some of all kindes, but not all of every kinde*; restraining and imprisoning the word, yet, as it were, *to libera custodia*. *The free gift came upon all men to the justification of life*, that is, it came upon all, upon whom it did come; freely; and yet upon many, which were not of Christs flock, it came not at all. If this seem harsh to any, there is a second interpretation, which came in my minde before ever I had heard or read, that any other thought so: and amongst a whole army of expounders, I never met with any who wholly agreeth with me; and never but one, whose opinion, in part, concurreth with mine: and he is Cardinall Tolet, who is found fault withall covertly, by Justinian the Jesuit, and by the learned Estius, under a generall *Quidam vir doctus*, *A certain learned man*; and expressely by name by Cornelius à Lapide the Jesuit: whose judgement otherwise I had been ignorant of, as not having Tolets labours on the Romanes. The words of S. Paul, Rom. 5. 18. at the latter end, are these, *By the righteousnesse of one*, (Δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος; *as Vatab.* δι' ἑνὸς ὁ δικαίωσις ἦν) *the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life*. So it is read (according to the Vulgat) in our late Translation: the Bishops Bible hath it, *Good springeth upon all men to the righteousnesse of life*: but it is certainly amisse; for they take δικαίωσις for δικαίωμα whereas there is great difference between them: for δικαιοσύνη is generally confessed to be (according to Philosophers) that vertue, or aggregation of vertue, which is named *Justice generall*: or (according to Divinity) the vertue, or the habit of justice, the work of grace, sanctification, righteousnesse, or holinesse inherent. Neither is δικαίωσις all one with δικαίωμα. for though I would be loath to say, as Beza doth on that place, *I do not admit*, saith he, *that these two are all one*, for this reason among others, *Lest some vain nicety should be attributed to the Apostle, that is, to the holy Ghost*, (for if I did admit them to be all one, yet I would rather admire the depths of the holy Spirit, which I am not able to sound, then ascribe any empty or vain nicety to the perfection of divine Scripture; *Whose plenitude I adore*, that I may use Tertullians phrase: whereas Beza intimateth, as if the infinite Spirit knew not to dictate what he could not understand) yet will I be bold to say, there is a main difference between them. δικαίωμα commonly is rendred *justificatio*. For grant, that among Heathen writers δικαίωμα be now and then expressed, *a just thing*, or *the*

Nè in vis quadam argutia tribuatur Apostolo, id est, Spiritui sancto.

[1] *Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem.* Tert. lib. contra Hermog.

ground-

ground now for such distinction of just misjudgment. Aristotle saith in Greek words also, that in Scripture ἀναλογία is used sometimes for the judgment of God, as Rom. 11. 33. and Revel. 15. 4. sometimes for the ordinances of God, as Luke 1. 6. and Hebr. 9. 1, and 10 verses, and Rom. 2. 26. but most properly it is rendred *justificatio*, and by it is meant the merit of Christ, and his righteousness imputed to us; and is in Christ, and now in us. Beza saith right in this, "The word ἀναλογία, *justification*, declareth (as I may say) the very matter of our justification from the effect, namely that obedience of Christ, the imputation whereof makes us righteous in him: which a little before he called χάρισμα, the free gift, because God giveth it freely to us. Thus is the imputation of Christs righteousness and our justification all one in effect, and onely divers in words to the same sense. This ἀναλογία is used both in the 16 verse, and in this present place: and thus Rev. 19. 8. *The fine linen is the righteousness of Saints*: Not of themselves, nor inherent: for to the Church *was given*, or granted, that she should be arayed (ut cooperiat se, as some reade it; ἵνα περιβάληται βύσσινον λαμπρὸν καθαρὸν γάρ τὸ βύσσινον τὰ δικαιώματα) *in fine linen, pure & white*: pure in it self; *white*, whilst to be seen by others. And since our Saviour, Revel. 19. 13. *was clothed with a vesture dipt in blood*; which Blasius Viegas saith, is commonly interpreted of Christs humanitie begored with his own bloud, by the Jews (which suffer me to term *Meritum rubrum*, as well as the School-men stile it *Meritum album*) which was pointed at, Esai 63. 1. *Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?* and vers. 2. *Wherefore art thou red in thine apparell, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fat?* which Tertullian wittily thus expounded, "The spirit of the Prophet contemplating, as it were, his Lord going to his passion, clothed with flesh, as suffering in it, describes by the redness of his garments the bloudy habit of his flesh trodden and pressed by the force of his passion, as by a wine-presse; because men come out thence, as it were, all bloudy with the redness of the wine. According to that prophesied of him, rather then of Judah, or of Judah, as a type of him, Gen. 49. 11. *He washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the bloud of grapes.* So that S. John may be thought to expound Esai, and Esai to reflect on that prophesie of Jacob; and all to designe out our Saviours passive obedience, by which (that I may so speak) our sinnes are most properly washed away, or not imputed. Upon proportionable semblance of reason, permit me to say, that the pure and white linen describeth Christs active obedience, his fulfilling of the Law, in number, weight, and measure: (which the School-men call *Meritum siccum*, a dry merit; and I, *Meritum candidum*, a white merit) which actions and performances of his, are as the fine linen with which the Saints are properly clothed and apparelled, when they are imputed to us. And thus, to return to my old matter, ἀναλογία in the place of

1. de cielo.

= Ἀναλογία ipsam justificationis nostræ (ut ità dicam) materiam hîc declarat ab effecto, nempe illam Christi obedientiam, cujus imputatio nos justos in ipso facit; quam paulò antè vocavit χάρισμα, quòd Deus gratis eam nobis largiatur.

Spiritus propheticus, veluti jam contemplans Dominum suum ad passionem venientem, carne scilicet vestitum, ut in ea passum, crucisque habitum carnis in vestimentorum rubore designat: concisum & expressa vi passionis, tanquam de torculari; vestimenta quasi cruentati botri habens de viâ rubore descendunt. Contra Marcionem 4. 40.

the Revelation is taken for the merits of Chriſt, clothing us with fine linen; as Jacob was with his elder brothers clothes, when he was to receive the bleſſing, Geneſ. 27. 15. ſo we with his righteouſneſſe, which is aſcribed unto us, as if it were our own; and now called *ours*, becauſe it was given unto us by *Him*. Yet thirdly and laſtly, beſides theſe two words, δικαίωσις and δικαίωμα, the Apoſtle uſeth another verball, differing from both: and that is δικαίωσις which (under correction) I opine is not to be tranſlated, either, with the Biſhops Bible, *righteouſneſſe of life* (for that is coincident with δικαίωμα) nor yet *juſtification*, or *Chriſts righteouſneſſe*, for then it were all one with δικαίωμα, which was immediately before aſcribed to Chriſt. But what is then δικαίωσις; & how is it to be tranſlated? It is but twice uſed in the New Teſtament. Firſt, Rom. 4. 25. ἐγήγερται διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν. *He was raiſed again for our juſtification.* But ſome Greek Copies have δικαιοῦσθαι, in ſtead of δικαίωσιν, in that place; and then the ſenſe altereth of it ſelf. Beza ſaith, δικαίωσις in the fifth to the Romanes ſignifieth more then it doth in the fourth, and ſeemeth thus to difference it, That, in Romanes the fourth, *the paſſive obedience imputed* is underſtood; and, in Romanes the fifth, *the active obedience imputed* is meant. And though in both places he doth Latinize it, *Juſtificatio*; yet the new-coined words of *Juſtificamen*, or *Juſtificamentum*, ſeem better in his judgement to expreſſe the ſenſe in the latter place. In this he ſaith wittily, that δικαίωσις is oppoſed τῇ κατακρίματι. And this is the onely argument of worth againſt the following opinion. Yet thus it may be anſwered, That though κατάκριμα be expounded *damnation*, or *condemnation*, or *a ſentence damnatorie*, as Beza calleth it; yet Beza himſelf will not tranſlate δικαίωσις, *a ſentence abſoluторie*, or *ſaving*. For there is no neceſſitie, that a direct oppoſition, in all parts, ſhould be between thoſe terms, neither doth the nature of the *antitheſis* neceſſarily require ſuch an exact contradiction. But how doth Tolet render and interpret theſe words? ¶ *He thinks* (ſaith Cornelius à Lapide of him) *that by the words* JUSTIFICATIO VITÆ, *The juſtification of life*, (which in the Vulgat is the expoſition of our δικαίωσις ζωῆς) *is here meant that action or operation whereby God through the righteouſneſſe & merit of Chriſt will raiſe up all men, even the reprobate, from death to a life for ever to endure.* And ſo the ſimilitude between Adam & Chriſt is every way compleat: for as by Adams ſinne all & every one die, ſo by Chriſts merit all & every one ſhall be made alive. And certainly for the truth of Tolets opinion, it is a part of our Creed, & denied of none: & it is expreſly avouched, even in the ſame comparative form, 1. Cor. 15. 22. *As in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.* But my opinion herein differeth from Tolets, That I do make, not onely Gods power & the merits of Chriſt concurring to this δικαίωσιν, but alſo make δικαίωσιν (which is more com-

p. *Sententia abſolutoria, vel ſalutifica.*

¶ *Putat juſtificationem vitæ hic appellari actionem & operationem, quâ Deus, ex juſtitia & merito Chriſti, omnes homines, etiam reprobos, à morte ſuſcitabit ad vitam perpetuò duraturam.*

commonly, then properly rendred *justificatio*) to be an act of man defending and pleading for himself, at the resurrection. As if the Apostle had thus balanced Adam and Christ: *As by the offence of the one, judgement came upon all to condemnation: so by the righteousnesse of the other, the free gift came upon all, that they shall all, without exception, be raised up; to know the cause, why they deserve wrath; to excuse themselves, if they can; to plead in their own defence, if they can justifie their lives, and free themselves from condemnation.* (For God condemneth no man without reason, nor without suffering him to come to his answer, nor without letting him see and know the just cause of his condemnation.) The substantiall truth whereof is confirmed, Rom. 14. 10. *We shall all stand before the judgement-seat of Christ, and every one of us shall give an account of himself to God*, vers. 12. The end is specialized, 2. Corinth. 5. 10, *That every one may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.* As for the objection of our adversaries, and their demand, where the word ἀναίωσις is so used in Scripture: I first retort it thus; Let them prove the use of the word, in Scripture, as they apply it. Secondly, I say, It is *iniquum postulatum, An unjust demand* on either side, since the word is onely once, onely here, in the New Testament, without variation of reading, so farre as I remember. Thirdly, I think that ἀναίωσις is opposed to ἀντιβολὴ, crosse-pleading, and all one with ἀντιδικία, as * Suidas expounds it: and what is ἀναιδικία, but *causificatio, causæ suæ defensio, juris sui in medium prolatio?* 2. Maccab. 4. 44. ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὴν ἀναίωσιν ἐποιήσαντο, *They pleaded the cause before him.* Yet nearer to the purpose, Psal. 43. 1. *Plead thou my cause*, Δίκασον τὴν δίκην μου *Litiga litem meam*, as it is in the Interlineary; *Disceptando tuere causam meam*, as Vatablus interprets it. And Psal. 35. 23. *Awake to my judgement, even unto my cause*. The Septuagint have it, εἰς τὴν δίκην μου and Symmachus readeth it, εἰς τὴν ἀναίωσίν μου. Where David makes God a Judge and Umpire, between David himself pleading his own cause, and Davids adversaries who pleaded against him, *and opened their mouth wide against him*, vers. 21. So that with Symmachus, ἀναίωσις is exactly the pleading of ones own cause, as here ἀναίωσις τῶν is the defence of a mans thoughts, words, and deeds in this world, and may in a good sense be called *a justification of his life*. Moreover, it is said, Exod. 12. 49. *Lex una erit indigenæ & peregrino. One law shall be unto him that is home-born, and unto the stranger*. Which is diversified, Levit. 24. 22. *Ye shall have one manner of law: Judicium unum erit vobis*, as the Interlineary readeth it; it being כְּמִשְׁפָּט here, whereas in the place of Exodus it was תּוֹרָה. Also in the Septuagint, the first place is thus, Νόμος ὃς ἔσται and in Leviticus, ἀναίωσις μία ἔσται where ἀναίωσις may well be expounded *one manner of pleading their causes*, as there was one law. This I am sure of, the verb is so used, Micah

* Apud Lysiam.

7. 9. *I will bear the indignation of the Lord, becauſe I have ſinned againſt him,* ἕως τὸ δικάσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου, *untill he plead my cauſe.* Why may not then δικάσαι be the pleading of ones cauſe? And why may not the meaning of our Apoſtle be, That as Adam was *oſtium mortis, The doore of death:* ſo Chriſt is *clavis reſurrectionis, The key of the reſurrection:* as Tertullian ſweetly calleth him: And as by Adam all and every one was guilty of death and damnation: ſo by Chriſts merit every one ſhall ariſe, to free himſelf from it, if he can; and to plead wherefore he ſhould not be condemned; to defend himſelf, and anſwer for himſelf, as Paul did, Acts 26. 2. to apologize: And herein Adam and Chriſt to be like, That as every one was made guilty, by one, of condemnation: ſo every one, for Chriſts all-ſufficient condignity, ſhall be permitted, yea enabled, to ſpeak for himſelf, why the ſentence ſhall not be executed. But theſe things I leave to the Profeſſours of the Greek tongue, and *ſuo quiſque judicio abundet.*

So much for the ſecond expoſition of the words, and for the ſimilitudes and diſſimilitudes between Adam and Chriſt; from which reſulteth, That Adam repreſenting us, did not ſo much hurt us, as Chriſt repreſenting us did do good unto us. And therefore, ſince we are acquitted from ſinne, from all ſinnes, originall and actuall; ſince we are acquitted from eternall death, and have grace, and abundance of grace, and the gift of righteouſneſſe, and ſhall have life eternall, and ſhall reigne in life, by ones obedience, by one onely Jeſus Chriſt, who in his life, and on the altar of the croſſe merited all theſe things for us: it is no hard meaſure, no iniquity of God, if for Adams ſinne and diſobedience, when he ſuſtained our perſons, both himſelf and his poſterity in his loyns, implicitly conſenting with him, be appointed to die. And thus much ſhall ſuffice for the firſt generall Queſtion upon the words of the Text. The ſecond followeth.

Druſius towards the end of his Preface before his book called *Enoch*, thus, * *Theſe, and other things which are contained in this book, as alſo in all other books which have been or ſhall be ſet forth by me, I willingly ſubmit to the cenſure of the Catholick Church; from whoſe right judgement if I diſſent, I will not be pertinacious.*

* *Hæc, & alia quæ hoc libro continentur, ut & in aliis omnibus à me unquam editis aut edendis, ſubjicio libens Eccleſiæ Catholicæ judicio, à cujus recto ſenſu ſi diſſentio, non ero pertinax.*

O Deity incomprehenſible, and Trinity in Unity; in all reſpects ſuperexcellent and moſt admirable; with all the faculties of my ſoul and body I humbly beg of thee to ſhew thy mercy upon me, for Jeſus Chriſt his ſake: and O bleſſed Redeemer, accept my prayer, and preſent it with favour to the throne of grace, where thou canſt not be denied. If thou, O gracious Jeſu, art not able to help me, and to ſave my ſinfull ſoul; let me die comfortleſſe, and let my ſoul periſh: but ſince thy power is infinite, I beſeech thee to make me one of thoſe whom thou bringeſt to more happineſſe, then all our enemies could bring to miſerie. Heare me, for thy tender mercies ſake, and for thy glorious name, O great Mediatour Jeſu Chriſt.

AMEN, AMEN.

MISCELLANIES OF DIVINITIE.

THE SECOND BOOK.

CHAP. I.

Sect. I. The question propounded, and explained.

2. Armenius, or rather Sir James Zoroaster, dead, and revived.

3. Antalus dead, and living again, because the messenger of death mistook him, instead of Nicander. Nicandus died in his stead.

4. A certaine Christian died, and recovered life. Lived an Anchorite twelve yeares; died religiously.

SECT. I.

THe second Question, which, from the words of my Text, I propounded, is this: Whether such as have been raised from the dead, did die the second time, yea, or no? because it is said, *It is appointed for men once to die.* I speak not of those who have been thought to be dead, and have been stretch't out, and yet their soul hath been within them: though divers, for divers daies, and upon severall sicknesses, have had neither heat, nor breathing discernable: but onely of such, who have suffered a true separation of their souls from their bodies. Whether these have again delivered up the ghost, and died, I make my question.

2. Before I come to mention those whom the Scripture recordeth to be truly raised, I hold it not amisse, to propound to your view a few stories out of other authours. Theodoret, *lib.* 10. *de fide & judicio*, hath two strange relations. The first is out of Plato, of one Armenius: but Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* 5. relateth from Zoroaster himself, that it was Zoroaster,

the sonne of Armenius: *He who onely, of all the world, laughed so soon as he was born* (saith Plin. 7. 16.) *and was so forward a Magician*. One of these two, either father or sonne, the twelfth day after he was slaine in the battell, and was to be buried, *ante pyram resuscitatus, revixit*, and being come to himself, told what he had seen *apud inferos*: namely, that his soul being divided from his bodie, came with many others, (who died with him) to an admirable and incredible place, in which there were two gulfs, opes, or ruptures of the earth, and two open places of heaven right over them. In the midst of these *hiatus*, or gulfs, judges did sit; who, when judgement was ended, bade the just souls ascend by the heavenly openings and gaps: the judges sowing on their breasts, the notes of their judgement. But the souls of the wicked men were commanded to go on the left hand, and to be hurried to hell, carrying with them, on their backs, the memoriall of their passed life. But as for himself, being now come in sight, the judges bade him diligently heare and see all things, and tell all those things which were done, when he revived. *These are sayings worthy of Philosophy*, saith Theodoret.

3 A second storie is cited in the same place, by Theodoret, from Plutarch, among those things which he wrote *De animæ Sositiles, Heracleon, and I* (saith Plutarch) *were present, when Antillus told us this, of himself: The Physicians thought Antillus to be dead: but he came to himself, as one out of a deep sleep, and neither said, nor did any other thing, which might argue him to be crazy or light-headed: but he told us, that he was dead, and that he was again revived, and that his death upon that sicknesse, was not altogether irrevocable: but that the messengers, who brought him to judgement, were sharply blamed by their governours, because they brought Antillus in stead of Nicandas. Within a while after, Nicandas died, and Antillus recovered life and health.* And Plutarch, in my opinion, seemeth to insinuate, that he was present at the recovery of him. Of both these (if each particular were true, that they were dead, and relived) we may boldly averre, that they died again. Neither doth Plato, Plutarch, or Theodoret doubt of it. As strange a storie, though more remote from our subject, you shall finde in Alexander ab Alexandro, *Genialium dierum*, 6. 21.

* *Quod cuncta mentis signum possit censeri.*

4 An other instance you shall finde in Bellarmine, *De arte bene moriendi, lib. 2. cap. 1.* taken out of Joannes Climachus, *in scala sua, grad. 6.* who relates thus of a man, that died twice: *In his first life* (saith he) *he lived most negligently: but dying, and his soul being perfectly separated from his bodie, after one houre he returned again, and he desired Climachus, and the rest, to depart. Whereupon they walled up the cell, and he lived (as an Anchoret) within the cell, twelve yeares; speaking to no man till he was ready to die again; eating nothing but bread, and drinking water: sitting so, he astonished-*

astonished, revolved those things onely, which he had seen in his separation, with so earnest a thought, that he never changed countenance, but continuing in that amazement, secretly wept bitterly. When he met w deaths doore the second time, they forced open the entrance into the cell, and coming to him, humbly desired him to speak some words of doctrine. He answered nothing but this onely, b The serious remembrance of death will not consist with sinne. The like storie you may finde in Venerable Bede.

All these, if they lived again, died again, and rose not to life immortall. And in this sense is that averred, Wisd. 2. 1. *Never was any man known to have returned from the grave*; viz. not to die again: for otherwise, some were known to have been raised. From these I come more especially to speak of such, whom the word of God reporteth to have been raised.

b *Nemo qui veræ mortis memoriam agnoverit, peccare unquam poterit.*

MOst gracious God, who didst breathe into the face of man the breath of life, and at thy pleasure drawest it forth again out of his nostrils; grant that we make such use of this present life, that we may see, love, and enjoy thee in the life eternall, through Jesus Christ our onely Lord and Saviour. Amen.

CHAP. II.

1. *A division of such as have been raised. They all died.*
2. *The widow of Zarephath her sonne raised, yet died again: supposed to be Jonas the Prophet. The Shunammites sonne raised, not to an eternall, but to a temporary resurrection. A good, and a better resurrection.*
3. *Christ the first who rose, not to die again.*
4. *The man raised in the sepulchre of Elisha, arose not to immortality.*

1. AND because divers have been raised up, of whom there is not the like doubt, and answer in each kinde to be made, I will therefore distribute them, in regard of their times, into three sorts:

1. Before Christs death.
2. After he was ascended.
3. About the time of his death.

Such as were raised

Which invented method I purposely choose, because I will reserve the hardest point to the last.

The firſt ſort again is ſubdivided into ſuch as were raiſed, either before Chriſt was incarnated, or by Chriſt himſelf.

They who were raiſed before Chriſt was born, were three:

1. The widow of Zarephath her ſonne, 1.King. 17.22.

2. The Shunammites ſonne, 2.King.4.35.

3. A dead man who was caſt into the grave of Eliſha, *and when he touched the bones of Eliſha, he revived, and ſtood upon his feet*, 2.King.13.21.

All theſe three were raiſed up to live, and lived to die again. Neither did the intention of ſuch as requeſted to have them raiſed, or of ſuch as raiſed them, aim once, that they ſhould live immortally: but live onely on earth again as other men did, and then die again. Neither did I ever reade any, who held theſe to ariſe to immortall glory: neither ſtands it with reaſon. For that they were once dead and raiſed to life, the Scripture ſaith: and that they muſt either live to this time, or be tranſlated to immortall glorie in their bodies, or die, Is as true as Scripture. Now, becauſe there is no ground to ſay, that they yet live, or were tranſlated bodily into heaven; there is good ground to conclude, that again they died.

2. Concerning the firſt of theſe: the Jews think he was Jonas the Prophet: and S. Hierome, in his Prologue on Jonas, citeth their opinion, and diſlikes it not. Toſtatus alſo ſaith, *Divers others think ſo.* If Jonas were the widow of Zarephath her ſonne, we know that Jonas died afterward: for *the Prophets are dead*, Joh. 8. 53. and he was one of the Prophets. And concerning both the firſt and ſecond inſtance, it is thought by many good Authours, that they are pointed at, Heb.11.35. *The women received their dead raiſed to life again*: or, *the Prophets delivered to the women their dead*, as the Syriack reads it; that is, to converſe with them as formerly, being raiſed not to an eternall, but a temporary reſurrection; and ſo to die again at their appointed times. And to this truth the Text it ſelf giveth in evidence: for it is ſaid in the ſame verſe, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσι, *that they might obtain a better reſurrection.*

Of holy men there is a double reſurrection; the firſt, and the laſt; the good, and the better. The reſurrection mentioned in the beginning of the verſe was good: and *with reference to the former* (ſaith Chryſoſtom) *the latter reſurrection is called the better.* For the former was *temporary*, the latter *eternall*, called alſo *The holy reſurrection* in our book of Common Prayer, in the Epiſtle on the ſixth Sunday after Trinity; though there is no ſubſtantiall ground for the word *holy*, either in the Latine, or Greek, Rom.6.5. Of the former, Aquinas, in his Comment in Hebr. 11. 35. ſaith it was rather a *reſuſcitation* then a *reſurrection*: and again, [a] *Theſe being raiſed died again, but Chriſt riſing from the dead, dieth no more*, Rom.6.9. And

[a] *Iſti ſic reſuſcitati, ſunt iterum mortui: Chriſtus autem reſurgens ex mortuis, jam non moritur*, Rom.6.9.

3. And therefore *Christs resurrection was* (as Aquinas saith, and as it is indeed) *the beginning of the future resurrection.* Then must they needs die again who were raised before him. He was the first Guide that lead the way to the eternall resurrection. *He abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light*, 2. Tim. 1. 10. Life and immortalitie to light, which were before in darknesse. And I think that the Apostle may well be thus paraphrased in that place to the Hebrews: *The women desired that their dead children might be raised again*, (1. King. 17. 18. 2. King. 4. 22, &c.) *and, as a gift they received their dead raised to life again; to live with them according to their desire. But others were tortured, and would not accept deliverance, and cared not for the joyes of this life, or the punishment unto death, nor temporary raising, that they might obtain the better resurrection, not to die again, as the others did, but to live for evermore.*

4. But as for the third, Tostatus saith, *He lived a long time, and he was more healthie then he was before he died.* And he giveth this sound reason, *Because those things are done supernaturally, are farre more perfect then they that are done naturally.* Never was there so good wine, as the water turned into wine: the choicenesse whereof was so easily discerned, even when the palate was cloyed, when the taste was corrupted and dull'd, towards the end of a feast, Joh. 2. 10. Now as he lived a long time, so out of doubt in the end he died, tasting of mortalitie as truely as the Prophet did, whose bones before had raised him.

O Blessed Jesu, I beg not at thy hands the reuniting of my soul unto my body, for a temporary life. but, if it be thy holy will, let the vertue of thy Passion raise me first from the death of sinne, to the life of righteousnesse; and from a righteous temporary life, to the life of immortall happinesse. Grant this, for thy glorious Names sake, O holy Redeemer.

CHAP. III.

1. *Whilest Christ lived, none raised any dead save himself onely.*
2. *The Rulers daughter raised by Christ, died again.*
3. *So did the young man whom Christ recalled to life.*
4. *Many miracles in that miracle of Lazarus his resurrection.*
5. *Christ gave perfect health to those, whom he healed or raised.*
6. *Lazarus his holy life, and his second death.*

1. THe next place of my division leadeth me to treat of those whom Christ himself raised. For if Christ did give authoritie to his twelve Apostles *to raise the dead*, Matth. 10. 8. though *both in the old Interpreter and Theophylact these words are wanting*, saith Beza: yet did they not, of the Seventie, at their return to him, say they had raised any, (which he himself did so sparingly) though *they healed the sick*, Mark 6. 13. and *the devils were subject unto them through his name*, Luk. 10. 17. Neither did the Baptist, nor any in Christs life-time raise up any; so farre as can be gathered. It was a work he appropriated to his own power, for the act thereof, whilest he lived; and which he maketh to be an infallible token and proof that he was the Messiah, as appeareth by the answer of the ambassage which Christ returned to the Baptist, Luk. 7. 22. *The dead are raised* by me, or by my power: Therefore I am he that should come. For that is one member of his argument. And indeed (perhaps) he raised divers, whom the Scripture hath not particularized: for *he did very many things that are not written*, Joh. 21. 25. Yea, *many signes truely did he in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book*, Joh. 20. 30. and his Apostles after his death did actuate that power, which habitually in his life they received.

2. But those that are mentioned to be raised by Christ, whilest he lived on earth, are likewise three:

1. A Rulers daughter, Matth. 9. 25.
2. A dead man, the onely sonne of his mother, Luk. 7. 15.
3. Lazarus, his friend, Joh. 11. 44.

And all these returned to do their offices, and follow their vocations in this life; and in the end payed their due to nature, and died again.

In

In the first we observe, that she was a damsel of twelve yeares of age, and being dead, *her spirit came again*, Luk. 8. 55. *She arose and walked*, Mark 5. 42. and *Christ commanded to give her meat*, in the same place of Luke. And as the meat was commanded to be given her, that they might see she was to live such a life as before she lived: so, out of doubt, the commanded meat was offered unto her, and she did eat, and was strengthened by it: both living and dying afterwards, as other maids and men did, and no way rising to immortall life.

3. As for the second, he was a young man, on whose mother *Christ had compassion*, Luk. 7. 13. She was a widow, the youth her onely sonne: and when Christ touch'd but the coffin, and said, *Young man arise*, (that you may see both his vertue and his voice had a piercing and quickning power) *he that was dead sat up, and began to speak, and Christ delivered him to his mother*, vers. 15. Now, these are evident signes of a naturall life in a naturall body, which must yeeld in the end to the stroke of death. And the raising of this young man being bruited abroad, was the especiall motive why the Baptist sent two disciples with a message unto Christ, Luk. 7. 17, &c.

4. The third whom Christ raised was Lazarus, who had been buried foure dayes ere Christ came unto him, Joh. 11. 17. (that I may passe over the uncertain time from his death to his buriall) *Stinking after foure dayes entombing*, saith S. Augustine: Yet when *Jesus cried with a loud voice, Lazarus come forth, he that was dead came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin: and Jesus saith unto them, Loose him, and let him go*, Joh. 11. 44. In which miracle I finde foure or five wrapped up and involved: That so suddenly his soul did come from its abode: That the stinking ill-organized body was so soon, so well prepared: That the soul was so quickly united; and no sooner united, then exercising her faculties on the bodie, which yeelded such ready obedience: That he could see the way out of the grave (and, perchance, approach towards our Saviour) when his eyes were blinded: That he was able to go and walk before he was loosed by them, while his hands and his feet were bound with grave-clothes. Yet that the miracle aimed not to raise him to an immortall life, appeareth, because he did not onely go from his grave to Bethanie, to the house where his sisters, Mary and Martha were, but because he supped with our Saviour; he being *one of them that sat at the table with Jesus*, Joh. 12. 2. where, out of doubt, he did eat as the rest did.

There is an argument yet left, as undeniable, as unanswerable. That the then living did think Lazarus lived to die again: For, *the chief Priests consulted that they might put Lazarus to death*, as well as Christ, Joh. 12. 10. Which they would

a *Fœtet, & putrefaciunt.*

not, they could not have done, if he had not lived, and could not die like other men; if he had been raiſed to life immortall: and they knew he was once raiſed, Joh. 11. 43, 47.

5. Concerning the ſick that were healed, and the dead raiſed by Chriſt, worthy Writers further agree, that Chriſt did *integram corporis ſanitatem conferre, omni infirmitate rejecta, Left no reliques of ſickneſſe or infirmity when he healed.* Chriſt never healed any one man twice, Joh. 7. 23. Ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῆ ἐποίησα, *Totum hominem ſanum feci, I made a man every whit whole, Healed a man wholly*, ſay the Rhemiſts. Perhaps I may adde, that Chriſt never healed the body of any, but he healed his ſoul likewiſe, at leaſt for the inſtant time. I am ſure Chryſoſtom, Auguſtine, and Beda to this purpoſe ſay, The ſame man was healed by Chriſt, Joh. 5. 14. *Qui foris ab infirmitate, ipſe etiam intus ſalvavit à ſcelere.* He ſaved the man from outward infirmitie and inward ſinne: He healed (as I may comment on the words) his body at the pool of Bethesda, his ſoul in the Temple. Chriſt himſelf ſaid, *Totum hominem ſanum feci, I have healed the whole man:* and Beza on Joh. 7. 23 ſaith, *He was healed both ſoul and body: Corporaliter & ſpiritualiter, Both bodily and ghoſtly*, ſaith Hugo Cardinalis. Even he, who was impotent, and had an infirmity thirty eight yeares, upon Chriſts command *immediately was made whole, and took up his bed and walked*, Joh. 5. 9. *and immediately*, upon Chriſts word, *the blinde received his ſight*, Mark 10. 52. the deaf and ill-ſpeaking man, after Chriſt had ſaid, EPHPHATHA, *his eares were ſtraightway opened, and the ſtring of his tongue was looſed, and he ſpake plain*, Mark 7. 35. *The fever immediately left Simons wives mother, after Chriſt took her by the hand, and lift her up: and ſhe miniſtred unto them*, Mark 1. 31. Chriſt left no relique of any old diſeaſe, and whom he healed of any one infirmitie, we never read that he complained of any other. So though Lazarus before his death, was ἀσθενῶν, *Languens, longâ infirmitate fractus, alias agrotus, Pining, feeble, ſick*, ſaith Salmeron: yet was he immediately and perfectly cured: and (as I imagine) he was upon his reſuſcitation, not onely *in latitudine ſanitatis, Void of all weakneſſe*; ſo that no part was ſick or miſ-affected by any dyſcraſie: but *in perfectione ſalutis, In full compleat health*; and had obtained by Chriſt, ἀκμὴν ſanitatis, *The height and fulneſſe of health; a conſtant, ſetled, habituall ſoundneſſe in each part of his body.* For as art is but the ape of nature, and naturall things are farre more abſolute and perfect then artificiall: ſo things miraculous as much exceed things naturall in perfection. So that no naturall *craſis*, no temper or temperature, no health is ſo pure and exact, as that which is wrought immediately by a divine finger. In the vigour and ſtrength whereof Lazarus might have lived, as Adam and Eve did, a long time.

6. What

5. What do I speak of likelihoods, or possibilities, when we have good Authours which give us more light concerning Lazarus his life, and concerning his death? *There is a manuscript of the English historie in the Vatican at Rome, testifying, That about the 35 yeare of Christ* (saith Baronius on the same yeare) *Lazarus, Marie Magdalene, and Martha, with Marcella their waiting-woman, with Maximinus their disciple, with Joseph of Arimathea their companion, were put into a little sciph, or great boat, without sayles or fit tackling, and so were in great danger at the sea: but by Gods providence, they arrived at Marsilis, a citie of Provance in France.* Tostatus upon 1. King. 17. saith, *Lazarus was a Bishop, and an holy Martyr.* Epiphanius in the catalogue of Manichæus his assertions, saith he hath it by tradition, that *Lazarus was thirty yeares old when he was raised up, and that he lived afterward other thirty yeares.* See the same Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 66. Gregory the great, *Dialog. lib.* 4. 28. addeth, that *Lazarus never laught after he was raised, and he did so tame himself with fastings, watchings, and labours, that his very conversation did seem to speak, (though he held his tongue) that he had seen the infernall torments.* So farre Gregorie. Yet, under his correction, he might as well, and as much bring his bodie under, and flee from the verie inclination to sinne, because he had tasted of the joyes celestiall, and peace unconceivable? Thus have you the life and death of Lazarus.

[a] *Impenebatur navis absq; remigio.*

[b] *Massiliam appulerunt.*

O Thou who art the Resurrection and the Life, quicken me with thy Spirit, lead me by thy grace, and crown me with thy glory, for thy tender mercy, O my sweet Saviour, my joy and delight, the life of my soul, my Mediatour and Advocate, Jesu Christ. Amen.

CHAP. IIII.

1. *Tabitha died again.*
2. *So did Eutychus.*
3. *They who were raised about the Passion of Christ, died not again, as many ancient and late Writers do imagine. Mr. Montague is more reserved.*

1. NOw am I come to speak of those, who after Christs ascension were raised. For though in his life time, none of Christs inwardest disciples or friends raised any; (as Elisha's servant could not raise the Shunamites sonne, but Elisha himself must do it, and did it, 2. King. 4. 31, &c. And Elisha

sha himself raised none, while his master Elijah lived, but Elijah himself did it, 1. King. 17.22.) yet after Christs ascension, by his power communicated to them, *the beleever shall do the works that I do, and greater works then these shall he do*, saith Christ, Joh.14.12. One was raised by S. Peter, an other by S. Paul. You shall finde the first, Act.9.40. When Peter had *kneeled and prayed, and turned him to Tabitha her body*, and *said, Tabitha, arise; she opened her eyes, and when she saw Peter, she sat up.* Yet was she dead before, and washt, and laid in an upper chamber, vers.37.

2. And for the other, the storie is this, Act. 20.9. *As Paul was long preaching, Eutychus sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead:* perchance broken in some parts of his bodie; bruised certainly: him S. Paul raised, and *they brought the young man alive, and were not a little comforted*, vers.12. Of these two, as well as of the rest, there is no doubt but that they lived again, again to die. So thinks Aquinas, 3.*part. Summ. Quæst.*53. *Artic.*3. and the whole School (following him) agree with us in this. So Suarez, Lorinus, who not? Take one of the ancients for all: Cyprian reckoneth up those who were raised in the Old Testament; and others raised by Christs command; and saith of these, [h] *They lived a while, and died again:* and a little before of them in the Old Testament, [i] *They tasted of death the second time.* And therefore it needs the lesse proof, because none denieth it: and the contrary needeth the lesse disproof, because none hath averred it.

3. Now it is time to come to the third and last part of my main first division, and to speak of them who arose about the time that Christ died; for of them there is a deep and intricate question: and the historie of them is set down at large by the Evangelist, Matth.27.52, and 53 verses: *The graves were opened, and many bodies of Saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.* So farre the text. Of the various pointing of which words see more hereafter, opening two windows for two expositions. On which words, divers worthy men, both modern and ancient, conclude, That those Saints died not again, [k] *But appeared to many, and, with Christ, never after were to die, but went into heaven*, saith Jacobus Faber Stapulensis. And Mr. Beza on this place opineth, that they did not rise, that again they might live among men, and die as Lazarus and others did: but that they might accompany Christ, by whose power they rose, into eternall life. *The late Writers* (saith Maldonate) *think, that they went into heaven with Christ:* and with them doth himself agree. So Pineda on Job 19.25. So Suarez a third Jesuit. So Anselm.

So

[h] *Aliquo tempore beneficio vitæ usi, iterum ad funera redière;* Pag. 523. de Resur. Christi, paragr.8.

[i] *Ad mortem quam gustaverunt iterum redierunt.*

[k] *Sed apparuerunt multis, & etiam cum Christo, nunquam ultrà morituri, abierunt in cœlum.*

so Aquinas on the place, and on the Sentences, So (if Suarez cite them truely) Origen in the first book to the Romanes, about those words of the first chapter, *By the resurrection of Jesus the Lord.* and Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom. 6.* and Justinus, Quæst. 85. Ambrose in his Enarration on the first Psalme, and Eusebius, Demonst. 4. 12. and of modern Authours, and of our Church, Bishop Bilson in the effect of his Sermons touching the full redemption of mankinde by the death and bloud of Jesus Christ, pag. 117. So Baronius *ad annum Christi 28. num. 141* concerning those Saints whom Christ piercing the heavens carried with himself on high, leading captivitie captive, Ephes. 4. 8. More reserved and moderate is Mr. Montague, that indefatigable Student, sometime my chamberfellow, and President in the Kings Colledge in Cambridge, now the Reverend Lord Bishop of Chichester, who in his answer to the Gag of the Protestants, pag. 209. saith of these Saints, *They were Saints, indeed deceased, but restored to life, and peradventure unto eternall life, in bodies as well as soules.*

Most cleare Fountain of Wisdome inexhaustible, wash, I beseech thee, the spots of my soul, and in the midst of many puddles of errour, cleanse my understanding, that I may know and embrace the truth through Jesus Christ. Amen.

CHAP. V.

1. *Who were supposed to be the Saints which were raised, by such as maintain that they accompanied Christ into heaven.*
2. *A strange storie out of the Gospel of the Nazarens.*
3. *Adams soul was saved. Adams bodie was raised about Christs Passion, saith Pineda out of diverse Fathers: Thus farre Pineda hath truth by him. That the sepulchre of Adam was on mount Calvarie: so say Athanasius, Origen, Cyprian, Ambrose, Basil, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Eusebius, Anastasius Sinaita, Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople.*
4. *It was applauded in the Church in Hieromes time.*
5. *Theophylact thought Adam buried in Calvarie. Drusius unadvisedly taxeth the Fathers. Tertullian consenteth with other Fathers, and Nonnus, who is defended against Hermius.*
6. *At Jerusalem they now shew the place where Adam*

his

his head was found. Moses Barcephe saith, that Cain after the flood buried the head of Adam.

7. *The Romane storie of Tatius, and Capitolinus, much resembling the storie of Adam.*



To the clearing of this cloud, and that we may carry the truth visibly before us, I think it fit to enquire, First, Who these Saints were which thus miraculously arose; and then secondly to determine, Whether their bodies were again deposited in the earth till the resurrection; or, Whether in their bodies with Christ they ascended into heaven.

2. For the first, Hugo Cardinalis on Matth. 27. 52. hath an old storie: *It is said* (saith he) *in the Evangelisme of the Nazarens, that two good and holy men, who were dead before about fourty yeares, came into the Temple, and saying nothing, made signes to have pen, ink, and parchment; and wrote, That those who were in Limbus rejoyced upon Christs descent, and that the devils sorrowed.* Though the rest be fabulous, yet herein the Gospel of the Nazarens agreeth with our Gospel, That the names of the raised are not mentioned. Others have been bold to set down both the names and the order of them who arose.

3. Augustine, *Epist. 99. ad Euodium*, thus, * *Almost the whole Church agreeth, That Christ descending into hell, freed the first Adam thence.* That the Church beleeved this, *non inaniter*, not vainly, but upon some good ground, we are to believe; from whence soever the tradition came, though there be no expresse Scripture. If this be true of Adams soul, yet is it nothing to our question of his bodily resuscitation. Proceed we therefore to those that think his very bodie was raised.

Adam then arose, saith Athanasius in his Sermon of the Passion and the Crosse; saith Origen in his 35 Tractate on Matthew; saith Augustine, 161 quest. on Genesis; and others also, if Pineda on the fore-cited place wrong them not. And he giveth this congruential reason, That Adam, who heard the sentence of death, should presently also be partaker of the resurrection by Christ, and with him, who had expiated his sinne by death. To which may be added, That (as S. Hierom reports) the Jews have a tradition, that the ramme was slain on mount Calvarie in stead of Isaac; as also Augustine (*Serm. 71. de Tempore*) ratifieth. And to this day they say they have there the altar of Melchisedech. So Athanasius reports from the Jewish Doctours, that in Golgotha was the sepulchre

* *De illo quidem primo homine, patre generis humani, quòd cum ibidem (Christus ad inferna descendens) solverit, Ecclesia ferè tota consentit.*

chus of Adam. This is true: but it is not certain that Adams was raised, and not true, that he ascended bodily into heaven.

Mr. Broughton, in his observations of the first ten Fathers, saith thus: *Rambam recordeth that which the reason can deem, how the Jews ever held by Tradition, that Adam, Abel, and Cain offered, where Abraham offered Isaac, where both Temples were built, on which mountain Christ taught, and died. And as the place was called Calvaria, because the head or skull of a man was there found, and found bare without hair, and depilated,* saith Basil; *so divers Fathers have concluded, that Adam was there buried, and that it was his head.* See Origen, tract. 35. on Matth. Cyprian in his sermon on the resurrection; Ambrose in his tenth book of his commentaries on Luk. 23. Basil on the fifth of Esay; Epiphanius *contra Haeres. lib. 1.* Chrysostome *Homil. 84. in Joannem*; Augustine *Serm. 92. de Tempore*, and *de Civitat. 16. 32.* Euthymius on Matth. So Athanasius Sinaita, *lib. 6. in Hexam. in Tom. 2. Bibliothecæ Patrum*, and Sanctus Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople, *in Theoria rerum Ecclesiast.* as you may see *in Tom. 6. Biblioth. Patrum*; besides abundance of new writers, with whose names I delight not to load my page.

4 Hierom on these words, Ephes. 5. 14. *Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, &c.* telleth, how he heard one disputing in the Church of this place, thus: *This testimonie is spoken to Adam buried in Calvarie, where Christ was crucified. Which place was called Calvarie, because there was placed* Caput antiqui hominis, *Adams skull. Therefore at that time, when Christ, being crucified, did hang over his sepulchre, this propheſie was accomplished, saying, Arise Adam, that sleepest, and stand up from the dead; and not as we reade, ἐπιφαυσει σοι ὁ Χριστος, Christ shall give thee light; but ψηλαφησει, Christ shall touch thee: because by the touch of his blood, and of his bodie hanging over him, he might be enlivened, and rise.* Now though Hierom himself saith, that this sense agreeth not with the context; yet he leaves it to the Reader to judge, whether the thing be true, or no, and confesseth, that the words were pleasingly entertained by the people, and [1] *approved with applause extraordinary both of hand and foot.* And Epiphanius expressly affirmeth, that Adam was buried in Calvarie, and that the mountain was so called from Adams head there found; adding, [2] *Where our crucified Lord Jesus Christ, by water and blood which flowed from his pierced side, figuratively shewed our salvation from the primitive lump, whilest suspiciously he sprinkled the reliques of the first man.* Therefore, *Now was fulfilled,* saith he, *Surge qui dormis, Arise thou that sleepest, &c.* Ambrose and Paulinus seem to have read it so also, and Augustine

[1] *Quodam plausu & trepudio sunt accepta.*

[2] *Haeres. 46. contra Tatian. in fine.*

[3] *In quo crucifixus Dominus noster Jesus Christus, per aquam & sanguinem, qui fluxit ab ipso, per compunctum ipsius latus, in enigmate ostendit salutem nostram ab initio massæ, primi hominis reliquias respergere auspicatus.*

Augustine on these words, Psal. 3. 5. *The Lord sustained me*, citeth this place thus: *Arise who sleepest, and stand up from the dead, and Christ shall touch thee*: which reading was used also by others in Hieromes time.

3. Theophylact on Matth. thus: *They that hold traditions, say, Adam was buried in Calvarie. It is a Tradition* (saith he, on Mark) *from the ancient Fathers*: adding this, *Therefore Christ, who healed the fault and death of Adam, was there buried, that where was the beginning, there should be the end, and destruction of death.* On Luke he alledgeth this reason, [f] *Where the fall was by the tree, there by the tree also should be the rising again.* Now as this reason is but weak, so his words on John are worthie remembrance: *That the Tradition is Ecclesiasticall, not Judaicall, that it was published by Noah after the flood.* Whence we may justly tax Drusius in his first commentarie *ad voces novi Testamenti*, on the word *Golgotha*, who ascribeth the finding of Adams skull, and his buriall on Golgotha, to the too much credulitie of the Fathers, in beleeving the Jews. It rather makes against the Jews, and the Jews gain nothing (in my opinion) by that report. Certain old verses fathered on Tertullian, prove directly, that in the same place that Adam died Christ died also; and of Golgotha, and Calvaria in particular, thus runne the verses,

Hic hominem primum susceptimus esse sepultum,
Hic patitur Christus: sic sanguine terra madescit,
Pulvis Adæ ut veteris possit cum sanguine Christi
Commistus, stillantis aqua virtute lavari.
The first man here, they say, was buried,
The earth was here with Christs blood watered:
That Adams dust commixt with Christ his blood,
Might so be bath'd as in a soveraigne flood.

Tertullians Latine verses may be seconded with Nonnus his Greek verses on John 19. 17.

Εἰσόκε χῶρον ἵκοντο φατὶς ὀνόμαστον κρανίῃ,
Ἀδὰμ τὸν πρωτόγονον φερώνυμον ἄρτυε χοῦτις.

Which are thus translated,

Donec in locum venit nominati cranii,
Adam prisci nomen ferentem ambitu capitis.
Untill he came toth' place (as goes the fame)
Which from old Adams skull did take its name.

Where Nonnus concludeth, (as many other more ancient did before him) that it was called *the place of a skull*, from the first Adams head. The learned Heinsius (*Exercit. sacr. pag.* 196.) contradicting saith, *The Evangelist did not think the place was so called from Adams skull, nor that the word* SKULL *inclines to that sense: nor is it called* ADAMS SKULL,

[e] *Surge qui dormis, & exurge à mortuis, & contanget te Christus.*

[f] *Ubi per lignum casus, illic per lignum & resurrectio.*

skull, but THE PLACE OF A SKULL. Now whereas Epiphanius saith, that Adams skull was found in that place, (which gave occasion to the words of Nonnus) I marvell that they who were conversant in books of the Hellenists, found not the beginning of that fable. For in them, the word ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ is taken Collective, after the Hebrew manner. So in the Latine, 2 Sam. 7. 9. Ista est lex Adam, hoc usu, non ut nobis. Moreover Symmachus interpreteth τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, Humane nature. So where Josiah (2. Kings 23. 20.) is said combussisse ossa, to have burnt the bones of Adam, the Septuagint have it, ἐκαυσαν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ἐπ' αὐτό, He burnt the bones of men on it. Because therefore in this place, were the skulls of Adam, that is, of men, the place is called so. And whereas ΑΔΑΜ should be taken for ΜΗΝ, Nonnus by signing out the first Adam hath increased the absurditie of this error. To this effect Heinsius on that place. In this my defence of Nonnus, I give but a touch at the slip ἐν ἀνθ. which the Septuagint have ἐν ἀνθ. answerable to the Hebrew; & as the other slip of citing 1. Sam. 7. 9. in stead of 2. Sam. 7. 19. and, granting that ΑΔΑΜ is taken sometimes Collective both in Scriptures and some Hellenists; do desire to know how it is applied to this place. For, though there be mention of Adam in Nonnus, yet there is none in the Text, which might give the hint to the error of Nonnus, as Heinsius mistermeth it. And when Heinsius produceth one Hellenist expounding Golgotha, and there using ΑΔΑΜ Collective, he shall say something. But saith the worthy Heinsius, it is not called Cranium Adami, The skull of Adam, but Κρανίου τόπος, The place of a skull. I answer, Neither are the words Crania Adam, The skulls of men, as Heinsius understandeth it. For Luke 23. 33. it is said expresly, The place is called Κρανίον the other three Evangelists have it also, all and every of them, in the singular number, Κρανίου, τόπος. To the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, the place of a skull, Mark 15. 22. Called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull, as it is Matth. 27. 33. or as it is varied by S. John, He went forth into a place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew, Golgotha, John 19. 17. Even in the Hebrew, * GOLGOTHA is a Syriack word, not an Hebrew one, saith Hierom on the word, in his exposition of the Hebrew names, used by S. Matthew. He is seconded by [b] Bellarmine, who is confident, that the vulgar tongue, spoken, and written in the Apostles dayes, was the Syriack, and not the pure and sacred Hebrew; instancing in Golgotha. The truth is, though the termination be Syriack, yet it is an Hebrew word of the radix גלל, Circuire, To compasse; from whence comes גלגל, Sphæra, An orb, and גלגלתא, or גלגלתה (which the Caldeans and Syrians expresse by addition of Aleph) Caput, ob ejus rotunditatem, An head, for its roundnesse. Mercer and Cevallerius adde

[a] The words are in 2. Sam 7. 19. *This is the law of man*, saith Heinsius, *not of Adam*. Our translation hath it; *This is the manner of man*, without restraining it to the first Adam.

* GOLGOTHA Syrium est, non Hebraum.

[b] De verbo Dei 2. 4.

adde in the Italick letters, *The skull is properly so called:* [1] *Part is taken for the whole, and not for the whole bodie onely, but for the whole man: as when after the Latine guise, we say, By the heads,* meaning, *By the people.* So also in the common proverb, [k] *So many heads* (that is, *men*) *so many mindes.* From *Golgoleth* cometh *Golgoltha*, or *Golgotha*, the letter ל being taken away by Syncope, [l] *As was then usuall*, saith Drusius: yea, and [m] *for a sweet and pleasant sound sake*, saith Lucas Brugensis. For as the Syriack omits the first ל, reading it *Gogultha*, or, according to Drusius, *Gagultha*, (though Mercer and Cevallerius say it is *Golgotha* in the Syriack tongue) so the Greek and the Latine leave out the second ל, and reade it *Golgotha*. Now, since none of the Evangelists have the exact Syriack word, and S. John saith, *The place is called Golgotha in Hebrew*, let Golgotha passe, not for a Syriack, but an Hebrew word, especially since the Syrians have an other word, by which they signifie a skull, viz. *Karkapho*; and let us come up close to Heinsius.

If he could prove, that *Cranion*, *a skull* (being the word which all the Evangelists insist upon) is taken *collectivè*, for many skuls, in the Hebrew, Syriack, or by the Hellenists; if one skull could belong to many men, I would say his proof were sharp, and pointed: but since it is harsh to conceive, or to write, or say (not *the places*, but *the place*; not *of skulls*, but *of a skull*) *the place of a skull of men* (it being a very Solecisme in the Hebrew, and the Syriack, in the Greek, whether sacred or profane, and indeed in all languages) I must take libertie to say, Heinsius his argument is too weak and blunt, to hurt Nonnus; though we adde this his other exception, [n] *The place was called a skull, because many skuls were there.* I answer, Though many were there buried, and many other skulls were there extant; (as in other *Polyandriis*, or Ossaries, Church-yards, or Charnell-houses) yet since Adam was there buried also, how followeth it, that the place was called so from the ignoble many, rather then from the first Adam.

To speak truely, Golgotha was not an ordinarie dormitorie; there were no caves for buriall, there were no places of sepulchres. All malefactours, even amongst them at that time, were not there executed; onely some, for some offences: and all that there were executed, were not there interred, but some were removed to their private buriall-places. If from the multitude there congested, the place had its denomination; the three Evangelists (who have it τόπος κρανίου, *The place of a skull*) might most easily, and, in likelihood, one of them would have varied it τόπος κρανίων, *The place of skulls*: but because the Scripture is expresse, it was one single skull, from which the place was so called, and constant Tradition hath delivered, that Adam was there buried; and divers Ancients, besides Epiphanius, have both believed, and written,

[1] *Pars pro toto, imò & pro toto homine dicitur, ut cùm Latinè dicimus,* Per capita.
[k] *Quot capita tot sententiæ.*
[l] *Ex consuetudine illius temporis.*
[m] *Euphoniæ gratiâ.*
[n] *Quia in isto loco crania fuerunt Adam, hoc est τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ità dictus est locus.*

written, that Adams skull was there found; Nonnus had reason, in his paraphrase, to apply the Text unto Adam: neither is it a fable, errour, or absurditie. The Scripture saith, *The place of a skull*; Nonnus saith, with Antiquitie, *the place of Adams skull*; Heinsius saith, *It was called Golgotha, or the place of a skull, from the skuls of many men there buried.* Who hath most likelihood? Nonnus, or Heinsius?

6. Mr George Sands, in the relation of his journey, pag. 163. reporteth, that *on the left side of an olive, in mount Calvarie, there is a clift in the rock, in the which they say, that the head of Adam was found, and (as they will have it) there buried, (others say in Hebron) that his bones might be sprinkled with the reall blood of our Saviour, which he knew should be shed in that place, by a prophetical fore-knowledge.* And in the next page, he picturing out the chappels, and severall monumentes, hath honoured that clift, where they say the head of Adam was found, with a locall delineation.

Now because it may be thought, that the flood did overthrow sepulchres, houses, and monuments, and Adams amongst the rest; Moses Barcephi, in his book *de Paradiso*, excellently secondeth Theophylact, and saith, That Noah, (one knowing the flood, took into the ark with him the bones of Adam, and (*having tripartitely divided the world amongst his three sons*, saith Epiphanius *in Ancharato*, neare the end) *sent one to Egypt, unto Sem, unto Chus, Europe to Japheth*) bequeathed to them the head or skull of Adam, whereupon in the old graven tables the place Calvaria.

Not farre from the beginning of the first book of *Oracula Sibyllinorum*, Sibylla Babylonica saith, She was with her husband in the ark, at the generall undage, or custody time, which some do thus expound; that by *Sibylla*, is meant the *Faith*, which is nothing els, but the constant belief, and knowledge of the Fathers, delivered by Tradition: so *Sabata*, or *Sibylla* might be in the ark at the universall inundation, and in a sort, may be said to be married to Noah, or to Sem, with whom there remained (out of doubt) the most certain graphall Traditions: and among those, this might be one, that the graves of Adam, and his head there, after the flood, buried. See Baronius *ad Annum Christi* 34. *numero* 112. *& sequen.* Lastly, S. Hierome is fully and exactly for us. *Epist.* 17 *ad Marcellam.*

7. The Romanes have a storie [illegible] Suffer a digression not unworthy [illegible]

In Rome there was a hill, called [illegible] *from Saturnia dwelt there*, saith Festus. Varro, Dionysius, and Festus. After [illegible]

[illegible] faith, Propertius, *libro* [illegible]

pass, from Tarpeia, a traiterous maid there killed, and (as it were) buried under the ſpoils. See Plinie, *lib.* 29. 1. Propertius there intimateth, that ſhe expected marriage with Tatius; and ſpecializeth his reply in diſdain,

Nube, ait, & regni ſcande cubile mei.
Dixit, & ingeſtis comitum ſuperobruit armis.
Hæc, virgo, officiis, dos erat apta tuis.

Whilſt ſhe both wife and Queen did look to be,
He ſmothered her with women thrown upon her?
And ſaid, Virgin, this dowrie fitteth thee,
Being for thy ill offices the meetest bonus.

But Livie, confeſſing that by their armour ſhe was ſmothered, reporteth two different relations. Firſt, that ſhe compounding with them to have what they wore on their left arms, (which were, according to the preſent faſhion, bracelets of pure gold) they thought their promiſe quitted, by throwing to her, and on her, their targets. Others ſecondly ſay, ſhe demanded their principall ſervice of defence; and thereupon ſuſpecting that her intent was to deceive, they payed her in her own kind, and by them killed her.

Thirdly, upon this accident it received its ſurname of *Mons Capitolinus*. Ludovicus Vives, out Auguſtine *de Civit.* 4. 10. citeth Dionyſius ſaying, that it was called Capitolinus, *Ab humano capite in fundamentis reperto*, From a mans head found in the foundation of it. Livius, towards the end of his firſt book, ſaith, That in the foundation of the temple there appeared a mans head, and his whole face ſound and uncorrupt. Arnobius, *contra Gentes lib.* 6. almoſt in the beginning, inſtructeth us at large whoſe head this was: and from the ancient authorities of Sammonicus, Gracchus, Valerianus, and Fabius, declareth to the Romans themſelves, as well as to the other Gentiles, That there was one Tolus, ſlain by his brothers ſervant: that his head was cut off, and carefully laid for good luck ſake: that his grave or ſepulture was the Capitol: that the compoſition of the name, made the thing to be known: and that the citie of Rome, being to dedicate and name the temple, was not aſhamed to call it *Tolus Tarpeius*, Tolus the Tarpeian, rather than after Jupiters own name. And perhaps upon a relation of the head found on mount Calvarie, Adrian might cauſe Jeruſalem to be called not only *Ælia*, but alſo *Capitolina*, with reference to their hill and the head there buried. Thus much for

Digitatus Junio, which did ſhed thy moſt precious
Blood on the Croſſe, O pierce my hands, that drop of
thy blood diſtill upon my ſoul; that it may be preſented Blameleſſe at the Throne of Grace, and Juſtified before thee,
for thine own Merit and Mercy. Amen.

CHAP. VI.

1. *Hieron saith, Adam was not buried on mount Calvarie. Rabbi Hieram, Andrichomius, and Zuingerus say, he was buried in Hebron. Hieron censured, for doubting in this point, by Bellarmine.*

2. *Hierons arguments answered.*

3. *The Original defended against Hieron in Josh. 14. 15. And the name is not a proper name, but an appellative. Arba is where a proper name of a man. Adrichomius erreth in* Kiriath-Arbee, *and the words signifie not* Civitas quatuor virorum, The citie of foure men. *New expositions of* Kiriath-Arbee.

4. *It may signifie as well* Civitas quatuor rerum, The citie of foure things: *as,* Quatuor hominum, Of foure men. *The memorable monuments about Hebron.*

5. *It may be interpreted* Civitas quadrata, quadrilatera, quadrimembris, quadricollis; A citie foursquare, of foure sides, of foure parts, of foure hills.

6. *If Kiriath-Arba doth signifie the citie of foure men, yet they might be other men, besides the foure Patriarchs.*

7. *It had its denomination from foure Patriarchs, and from their buriall there, yet Adam is none of them.*

8. *Augustine peremptory for Adams buriall in Calvarie, and Paula and Eustochium of mother Hieroms.*

9. *Another objection answered. The Jews never shewed extraordinary honour to Adam, or Noah, but to Abraham, and others after him. Drusius preferreth the reading used by our late Translators, Heb. 11. before the Genevan and Tremellium.*

On the other side, and for the contrary opinion, [illegible] the same diction in Josh. 21. with a pugnasith, Calvarie signifieth, and that should be the first mention [illegible] the place of those three where Arbee, Secondly, [illegible] Arbee, saith Hierom. Thirdly, the accurate Adrichomius, [illegible] pag. 49. saith, that in the time of Josh. and Judg. Arbee, and Anakim, and Caleb in Arbee, the citie of foure men, because there foure Patriarchs, Adam, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, there

dwelt, and were buried. Franciscus Zimenes Archbishop of Toledo, and many others accord with him. S. Hierom led them all the way, though awry: Hierom, *in lib. de locis Hebraicis*, on the word ARBOCH, thus, [a] *It is corruptly written in our copies ARBOCH, since in the Hebrew it is read ARBEE, that is, Foure: because there the foure Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were buried, and the great Adam, as it is written in the book of Josua, though some suppose Adam to be buried in Calvarie.* The same Adrichomius, pag. 46. describeth a double cave in the tribe of Judah, which cave, with the ground and trees, Abraham bought of the sonnes of Heth, in which were buried Adam and Eve, Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebecca, Jacob and Leah, which *Mausoleum* continued till the time of S. Hierom. Now this place was close by Hebron, and Hebron and this sepulchre farre from mount Calvarie, 250 *stadia*, or there-abouts. Lastly, saith Hierom, *If any will strive that Christ was crucified in Calvarie, that his blood might distill on the tombe of Adam, I will ask him, why others, even theeves were there crucified?* The force of these authorities, or reasons, is not such, as to remove me from the common opinion, that Adam was buried in Golgotha. And thus I answer the Objections in order.

[a] *Corruptè in nostris codicibus Arboch scribitur, cùm in Hebræo legatur Arbee, id est quatuor: eò quòd ibi quatuor Patriarchæ, Abraham, Isaac & Jacob sepulti sunt, & Adam magnus, ut in Jesu libro scriptum est, licèt eum quidam condituin in loco Calvariæ suspicentur.*

1. Bellarmine, *de Amissione gratiæ, & statu peccati*, 3.12. bringeth Hierom against Hierom, and wondreth at his doubling: and he refuteth Hierom's arguments, and produceth many strange proofs, that Adam was buried in mount Calvarie. But I descend to the particulars.

2. The first is, a mistaken imputation of S. Hierom. For who saith, or ever said, that the word *Calvaria* signified the sepulchre of the first man? Neither can any man primarily argue from the names of *Golgotha*, or *Calvaria*, and גלגלת, or *Calvariæ locus, The place of a skull*, that Adam was there buried: nor yet doth *Calvaria* signifie *locum decollatorum*, though Hierom would have it so. But since *Calvaria*, מגלגלת, properly and natively, is truely translated *a skull, the skull of a man*; and גלגלת, *the place of a skull*, Matth. 27. 33. not *of skuls*, or *beheaded men*, in the plurall number, (for it is in the singular, in every of the Evangelists) and constant Tradition hath delivered, that Adam was there buried; we may conclude, not from the name to Adams buriall, but from the received opinion of Adams buriall in that place, unto the name, and may say, with divers Fathers, more then probably, It was termed *Golgotha*, or *the place of a skull*, with reference to Adams buriall, or his skull.

2. Secondly, S. Hierom groundeth his second reason on the sands, and offereth violence to the place of Scripture. Thus he readeth it, Josh. 14. 15. *Nomen Hebron ante vocabatur*

vel Cariath-Arbee, Adam maximus ibi inter Enacim situs est: Hebron was before called Cariath-Arbee, The first Adam was there placed among the Anakims. Whence he concludeth, That Adam was buried by Hebron and Arbee, and so not on mount Calvarie: for they were many miles distant each from other. I answer, that neither the Seventy nor Hebrew have, *Ibi situs est.* Secondly, what had Adam our Protoplast to do, or to be buried among the Anakims? Wiser Baronius in the place above-cited, misliking Hierom, makes the giants name in that place of Joshua, to be Adam: and not the first Adam to be one of the giants, or to be buried with them. Thirdly, both Hierom and Baronius are deceived, in thinking that *Adam* in that place is a proper name; for the words may, yea must runne thus according to the Hebrew, and is seconded by our later translations: *The name of Hebron before, Kirjath-Arba, whom as* (or *which Arba*) *was a great man, among the Anakims.* Now it were non-sense to say, *The name of Hebron, was the citie of foure, who was a great man among the Anakims*: and as senseless were it, Josh. 15.13. to reade it, *Caleb had the citie of foure, the father of Anak.* But taking *Arba*, for the proper name of a man, and the citie so called of him, the sense, reason, and truth are all apparent. *A great man, of whom the citie was so called,* saith Tremellius: *Arba was the name of a great man among the giants,* saith Aben Ezra: *Homo maximus,* saith Andrew Masius: *The greatest and chiefest among the giants,* saith Vatablus in his commentarie, and Emmanuel Sa in his notes on the place. This *Arba* was *the father of Anak,* Josh. 21.11. *And the sonnes of Anak were giants, and came of giants; and we were,* (say the Israelites) *in their and in our own sight as grashoppers,* Num. 13.33. And this also reflects an answer upon the third objection of Adrichomius, who though he be most accurate in other things, yet here he is asleep. For though *Arbee* signifie *foure,* when *Arbee* is not a proper name; and *Kiriath-arbee* may be rendered, *The citie of foure,* yet it may also signifie *The citie of one Arba,* or *Arbee* and so *Kiriath-Arbee* in Hebrew is no more, then *Arbepolis* in Greek, so called of one Arbee, who was a man, *The father of Anak,* Josh. 21.11. as I proved before: as *Persepolis, Adrianopolis, Constantinopolis, Alexandrinopolis* in India (as Appian Alexandrinus hath it in his book of the Romane warres with the Syrians) and *Alexandropolis,* a citie of Parthia, as Plinius 6. 25. varieth it. So *Magnopolis,* as Appian calleth one citie, in his book of the Romane warres with Mithridates; and *Pompeiopolis,* a citie of Cilicia: both of these so styled of Pompey the great: though the latter lost its name, and was after (at the best of the empire, and at its greatest growth) called ΤΡΑΙΑΝΟΠΟΛΙΣ, *because Trajan died there,* saith Solinus. So *Claudiopolis,* a citie of Cappadocia, Plin. 5. 24. and *Philippipolis,* a citie in Arabia,

so

so called of Philip the Emperour. All these cities, & many other (if it were worth the labour to recite them) had their denomination from men: likewise might *Arbopolis* be the citie of Arba. But why do I stand on *potentialls*, or *may-bees*, when Joshua at the chap. 15. 13. calleth it τὴν πόλιν Ἀρβὲ, as the Septuagint translates it? and Josh. 20. 7. τὴν πόλιν Ἀρβὲ, where it is in the Hebrew, *Arba*. Sara died ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἀρβὲ, Genes. 23. 2. *The citie of Arbock*: where both Hebrew and English have *Kiriath-Arba*, and the Vulgar, *In civitate Arba*, which is impossible to be rendred *The citie of foure*, in reference to the foure Patriarchs buriall: for both Abraham and Isaac were not buried, but alive then, and Jacob was not as yet born: yea the citie of Arba is called μητρόπολις, Josh. 14. 15. *And they gave them* τὴν Καριὰθ Ἀρβὲ μητρόπολιν, Josh. 21. 11. she being the mother-citie, and therefore the villages about Kariath-Arbee, are called *her daughters*, Neh. 11. 25.

4. Secondly, let us grant *ex superabundanti*, *More then we need*, that it is to be expounded in this place, *Civitas quatuor*, *The citie of foure*; yet it may be called the citie of foure memorable things that were there: as *Kiriath-jearim*, Josh. 15. 60. or *Kariath-Jarim*, as Adrichomius reades it, is, *urbs sylvarum*, *a citie of woods*; for so he expounds it pag. 22. and *Cariath-Sepher*, Josh. 15. 15. *that is*, (saith he on that word *Debir*, pag. 133.) [b] *A citie of learning*, *an Universitie of Palestine*. And he addeth, *It was* [c] *A strong and royall citie given to the priests*. The name of KARIATH-JARIM, *signifieth a citie of woods*, saith Masius, on Josh. 9. 17. and KARIATH-SEPHER *is* [d] *A citie of Records, or Libraries: and so called, in all probabilitie*, saith the said Masius, on Josh. 15. 15. See his conjectures on the place. Yea, the other name of *Kariath-Sepher*, to wit, *Kariath-Senna*, is either so called, *à spinis*, *from the thorns* (which may grow among the woods) as most do think; or *if the letter* ס *was set for* ש, *then the word hath reference to the disputations of learned men, as it is Deuter. 6. 7.* saith Masius. And the Seventy render it, in both places, τὴν γραμμάτων, *The citie of writings or letters*. Howsoever, as one of the cities was so called from the woods, or thorns; the other, from the Academie there flourishing, or from the monuments and records there kept, as Masius would have it: So might *Kariath-Arbee* be so named, from some other foure eminent things. For many excellent monuments, most famous in their kindes, were thereabouts: from some foure of which it might be named *Kiriath-Arbee*, *Civitas quatuor rerum*, *The citie of foure things*. The first was the Altar that Abram built there, Genes. 13. 18. Which perchance made Absalom feigne a vow, to sacrifice in Hebron, at the altar of Abram, 2. Sam. 15. 8. So the Seventy and Vatablus expound it. The second may be that famous tree, which some call *Ilex*, *An holm*; others *Quercus*, *An oak*, which is favoured by the Originall,

Gen.

[b] *Civitas literarum dicta, seu Universitas & Academia Palestina.*
[c] *Valida & regia urbs data sacerdotibus.*
[d] *Literarum vel librorum urbs.*

Gen. 18. 1. and 8. vers. Hierom, *Terebinthus*, The Turpentine tree: Under which, saith Adrichomius, *Abraham ministred to the Angels*; which continued till the time of Hierom, yea, saith Saligniacus, [a] *The holm is yet to be seen, before the entrance of the Tabernacle of Abraham*. The old being dried, an other sprung out of its root. Now this Saligniacus lived but awhile since. Besides, the *Quercus Mambre*, The oak of *Mambre* was so renowned, that Adrichomius, in his map of the Tribe of Judah, hath the resemblance and picture of an oak there growing. And *Constantine appointed a fair Church to be built at the oak of Mambre*, saith Eusebius in vita Constantini, l. 5. S. Hierom, *de locis Hebraicis*, thus, [b] *The oak of Abraham, called also the oak of Mambre, continued to the Empire of Constantine; and its monument is yet seen: And since we have built a Church in that place, all nations do reverence the place of the Turpentine tree, because under that did Abraham entertain Angels*. The third may well be *Spelunca Adam*, the cave where Adam mourned. Fourthly, the very plot of ground, where Abel was slain, which is shewed to this day. Fifthly, the monument of Caleb. Sixthly, the field of Damascus, where the red earth lieth, of which they report Adam was formed; which earth is tough, and may be wrought like wax, and lieth close by Hebron, all the other things also being in the circuit neare that place. Seventhly, the *Arcuatus Hebron*, Josh. 11. 21. and the *Vallis Hebron*, Genes. 37. 14. and the *Convallis Mambre*, as the Vulgat hath it significantly, Gen. 14. 13. *Convallis Mambre, quæ est in Hebron, The dale of Mambre, surrounded with hills, which is in Hebron*, Genes. 13. 18. The unparallelled eminencies of which hills and dales, for profit and pleasure, (the two main load-stones of the worlds desires) you may discern by what Mr George Sands saith (if he do not poetize, or hyperbolize) in the third book of the relation of his journey, pag. 150. *We passed this day* (saith he) *through the most pregnant and pleasant valley that ever eye beheld: on the right hand, a ridge of high hills, whereon stands Hebron, (oh how delicately situated!) on the left hand, the Mediterranean sea, bordered with continuall hills, beset with variety of fruits: the champion between, about twentie miles over, full of flowry hills, ascending leisurely, and not much surmounting their ranker valleys: with groves of Olives, and other fruits dispersedly adorned*. Eighthly and lastly, there were other things of singular note; Abrahams Church-yard, the field of Machpela, consecrated from heathenish profanation, to holier uses; and the cave, which was the place of his sepulchre. From some foure of these most reverend monuments, or the like, being but a little distant from Hebron, might the place be called *Kariath-arbe, Civitas quatuor rerum, The citie of foure things*.

1. Again, if that citie of Hebron were *quadrata*, as many cities then were, and now are, and with us Bristol amongst the

[a] *Ostenditur adhuc hodie ilex illa, ante ostium tabernaculi Abrahæ.*

[b] *Quercus Abrahæ, quæ & Mambre, usq; ad Constantii Regis imperium monstrabatur: & Mausoleum ejus in præsentiarum cernitur. Cujus à nobis jam ibidem Ecclesia ædificata est, à cunctis in circuitu gentibus, Terebinthus superstitiosè colitur*, (or as others better reade it, *Terebinthi locus colitur*) *ob quòd Abrahæus ibi ea Angelos hospitio susceperit.*

the rest (built of old by Brennus, as I have read in a manuscript of Edward the fourth his time) and renowned Rome (as some say, varying from Livie) which was first founded on the foure hills, Palatine, Capitoline, Esquiline, Aventine, (though afterward Servius Tullus enlarged it on the other three hills, Coelian, Viminal, and Quirinal) and answerable to which Romulus left (as they say) but foure gates, *Carmentalis, Romana, Pandana, Janualis*: though afterward there were many more gates belonging to that citie. You may finde this in a map of Rosinus, *Antiq. Roman. lib. 1. cap. 13.* describing the citie of Rome as it was built by Romulus; and afterwards made more great and capacious by the Kings. And Livie himself saith, That *when Romulus divided the tribes or wards of the citie into foure parts, he did it answerable to the quarters and hills of the citie.* It being (I say) probable, that the citie of Hebron was *quadrata*, it might be called Τετράπολις, and *Kiriath-arbee*, of רָבַע, RABA, *quadravit*: from whence cometh רָבוּעַ, RABUA, or RABUANG, *quadratum & quadrum, cujus latera quatuor longitudine & latitudine sunt aequalia*; *Whose foure sides are equall in length and latitude.* As Exod. 27. 1. *Altare erit quadratum, The Altar shall be foure-square*: from whence also cometh אַרְבַּע, ARBA, *quatuor*. So from the foure-square building of the citie, it may be called *Kiriath-arbee*; as old Jerusalem, *which was built foure-square on the foure hills, mount Sion, mount Moria, mount Oliver, and mount Bezetha*, saith the Translatour of the travels of the holy Patriarchs. As the new Jerusalem τετράγωνος κεῖται, *Quadrangularis sita est*, vel, *In quadro posita est, Lieth foure-square*, Apoc. 21. 16. So that *Kiriath-arbee, Civitas quatuor*, may be expounded, *Civitas quadrilatera, quadrimembris, quadricollis, A citie of foure sides, foure parts, foure hills*: for even so Rome is called *Septicollis, The citie of seven hills*. And Douza of late, and ancienter Nicetas, call Constantinople also πόλιν ἑπτάλοφον, *Urbem septicollem, The citie of seven hills*. And indeed, the same Translatour in his *Itinerarium totius Sacrae Scripturae, pag. 85.* thus reporteth, *Others there are that say, the citie Hebron, being divided into foure parts, was therefore called* Τετράπολις *for* ARBA *signifieth a quaternion, from thereon* רָבַע, RABA, *Foure-square*.

6. But grant we further, that *Kiriath-arbee* doth here signifie the citie of foure men: yet it followeth not, it was so called because Adam, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were these foure men. For *Heth, the sonne of that cursed Canaan, whose posteritie (the Hittites) inhabited in it, first built the citie*, saith he *ibid.* in his *Itinerar.* and Heth might be one of these foure men. Secondly, it is said Gen. 35. 27. *Jacob came unto Mambre, unto the citie of Arbee, which is Hebron.* Whence we may conclude, that the citie had three other names, of three other distinct men,

viz.

viz. of Mambre, who was Abrahams friend and confederate, Genes. 14. 13. (of Arbee, a great giant (as I proved before) of Hebron, one of Calebs sonnes so called, 1. Chron. 2. 42. But how in Jacobs time (or perhaps in Moses time, who wrote the book of Genesis) it might be called Hebron of Calebs unborn sonne, is difficult to conceive, unlesse by propheticall anticipation. Howsoever, Adrichomius saith word for word out of Hierom, [e] *Hebron was so called from one of the sonnes of Caleb.* I should rather think, Caleb himself, well known to Moses, might be the fourth man, of whom the citie might be called *Civitas quatuor hominum, The citie of foure men*, if from men it had its denomination of *Kiriath-arba*: For *Josuah gave unto Caleb, Hebron for an inheritance*, Josh. 14. 13. and because he drove thence the three famous giants, the grand-children of Arba, *the sonnes of Anak, Sheshai, Ahiman, and Talmi*, Josh. 15. 14. for Conquerours lefe their names unto the cities which they overcame, 2. Sam. 12. 28. Neither is it unlikely, but Caleb might call his sonne *Hebron*, after the name of the citie bequeathed him, rather then the citie, after his sonnes name, especially, since there is mention of a citie *Hebron* before there is any mention of a man *Hebron*, or of Caleb himself.

Moreover, I reade of an other exposition given by Salomo Trecensis, that it might be called *Civitas quatuor virorum, The citie of foure men*, from Anak and his three monstrous before-recited sonnes, who dwelt there. For both cities and lands have been called after the names of giants: as Ashtaroth, *alias* Hashtaroth, Aseroth, and Astaroth-Carnaim; and Carnaim-Astradoth in the confines of the land of Hus was a great citie, inhabited by giants called Zamzum, or Rephaim (and *the place*, saith Adrichomius, *was called* TERRA GIGANTUM) whom Chedorlaomer killed when in the time of Abraham he led an armie, and fought against the king of Sodom, Genes. 14. 5. And *there was a valley of giants not farre from the cave of Adullam*, saith Vatablus on 2. Sam. 23. 13. and the Seventie reade in that place, ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ τῶν γιγάντων, *In the cave or den of giants*: and so both the Interlinearie and Genevans have it in the margine, which others reade *in valle Rephaim*. So much be said to shew it might be called *Kiriath-arbee*, from other foure men, and not from the foure Patriarchs, if from foure men it had its appellation.

7. Grant we yet once again, more then we need, that it was called *Kiriath-arbee* from foure Patriarchs, yea and from the buriall of foure Patriarchs in that place (which can never be proved;) yet it is not evinced, nor will follow necessarily, that Adam was one of these foure Patriarchs there buried. S. Hierom, *in Epitaph. sancti Paulæ*, saith, Kiriath-arbee was [h] *The town of foure men*, of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the great

[e] *Hebron, ab uno filiorum Caleb, sortita est vocabulum.*

[h] *Oppidum quatuor virorum.*

great Adam, whom the Jews ſay to be there buried, according to the book of Joſhua; *Though* (ſaith he) [i] *muſt think Caleb was the fourth man, whoſe rib is a memorial.* And Adrichomius himſelf makes the ſepulchre of Caleb not farre from Hebron. The opinion of Adams being there buried, is fathered on the Jews: the common Tenet was, that Caleb was the fourth man. Probabilitie alſo conſorteth therewith: for if Adam had been there buried, as Abraham could not have been ignorant thereof, ſo he would, in that regard, have the rather bought that place, and perhaps would have given intimation of it to the children of Heth. But as it ſhould ſeem, Abraham ſtood indifferent at the firſt, and ſaid onely; *Give me a poſſeſſion of a burying-place with you*, Geneſ. 23. 4. And when they offered him any of their ſepulchres, he choſe the cave of Machpelah. To conclude, the objection of Adrichomius is thus anſwered: Kiriath-Arbee may ſignifie the citie of Arbee; or the citie of foure things noted and memorable; or the citie of foure angles, ſides, or parts; the citie ſited on foure hills; and if it be to be interpreted, *Civitas quatuor hominum, A citie of foure men*, the foure men may be, Heth, Mambre, Arbe, and Caleb; or Anak and his three monſtrous ſonnes. Howſoever, the word proves not, that foure men were there buried: and if it proved ſo much, yet Adam was none of theſe foure, for Adam was not buried in Hebron, but in mount Calvarie, as I proved before to the full, and yet ſhall adde more by and by.

8. To the laſt and fourth objection of S. Hierom, being a demand, why others even theeves were there buried? I anſwer, Though Adam were there buried, yet what hindered, but it might be a fit place for malefactours to be executed, eſpecially being on high, and without the walls of the citie? and both theeves might there ſuffer as in a place appointed for ſuch uſe by the Magiſtrate; and Chriſt might there die, as appointed by the ſecret providence of God, beyond the reach of man, that the bloud of the ſecond Adam might fall on the ſepulchre of the firſt Adam, and other ſinners: to ſignifie, that the water and bloud flowing from Chriſt, did purge even the greateſt malefactours, Adam, and the notorious ſonnes of Adam. Divinely ſaith S. Auguſtine, *Serm. 72. de tempore*, [k] *Truely, brethren, with good reaſon we beleeve, that there the Phyſician was lifted up where the ſick man lay: and it was well worthy that divine mercie ſhould there ſtoop, where humane pride fell; that Chriſts precious bloud vouchſafing corporally to touch and moiſten the aſhes of old Adam, may be beleeved to redeem him.*

To conclude, either the two learned women, Paula and Euſtochium, or Hierom rather himſelf (whoſe ſtyle it ſeems to be) *in Epiſt. 17. ad Marcellam*, ſaith; [l] *In this place then Adam*

[i] *Plerique Caleb quartum putant, cujus ex latere, memoria monſtratur.*

[k] *Et verè fratres non incongruè creditur, quia ibi erectus ſit Medicus, ubi jacebat Ægrotus: & dignum erat, ubi occiderat humana ſuperbia, ibi ſe inclinaret divina Miſericordia: ut ſanguis ille pretioſus, etiam corporaliter pulveres antiqui peccatoris dum digeſtus illando contingere, redemiſſe credatur.*

Adam both dwelt and died: From whence that place where our Lord was crucified is called CALVARIA, *because there was buried the head of the old Adam, that the blood of the second Adam, namely Christ, distilling from the crosse, might blot out the sinnes of the first-formed Adam, thereunder lying.*

9. An objection more, Franciscus Lucas Brugensis toucheth at, against this opinion: namely, that if the Jews had known that Adams sepulchre was on that mount Calvarie, they would have had the place in farre greater esteem; they would have deckt it with some stately monument; and never have suffered the malefactours inordinately there to be executed. The former part of which objection, as I do strengthen by Matth. 23.29. *Ye build the tombes of the Prophets, and garnish the tombes of the righteous*; saith Christ to the Scribes and Pharisees: so to it I answer thus; That there is not the least touch in Scripture, nor in any Authour, that I remember, that the Jews ever regarded or honoured Adam, or held him righteous, or gloried in him above others: nay, they thought ill of him, 2. Esdr. 3.21. &c. and 2. Esdr. 4.30. and finde fault with him 2. Esdr. 7.48. *O thou Adam, what hast thou done? for though it was thou that sinned, thou art not fallen alone, but we all that come of thee.* And a little before, namely verse 46. *This is my first and last saying, that it had been better not to have given the earth unto Adam; or else when it was given him, to have restrained him from sinning.* Mark also the Antithesis used Ecclesiasticus 49.16. *Sem and Seth were in great honour among men; and so was Adam above every living thing in the creation:* where he remarkably extolleth Sem and Seth, but praiseth Adams excellencie onely at the creation: And so Vatablus expounds it. Howsoever, after his fall he was not so highly esteemed as others were. No more did the multitude shew any extraordinary estimate of Noah, though as Adam was the fruitfull root, the protoplast; so Noah was the restorer of mankinde, under God: For these were the founders as well of Gentiles as Jews. But Abraham, and the Patriarchs, and the Prophets since them, they reverenced above measure, for the extraordinary blessings vouchsafed by God unto the Jews above the Gentiles for their sakes, and in them, and by them. Now to such indeed their posteritie builded tombes, Matth. 23.30. though their fathers had killed some of them.

To the second part of the objection, *Why they did suffer malefactours to be there punished*, I answer, that it is a doubt undecided, whether the ordinary delinquents were put to death on mount Calvarie, before the Romanes overcame the Jews. If not, then patience perforce; they could not remedie it, if the other appointed it. If so, yet the Jews might be ignorant of Adams sepulchre: and how could they grace

[1] In hoc tanto loco, & habitâsse dicitur, & mortuus esse Adam; unde & locus, in quo crucifixus est Dominus noster, CALVARIA appellatur, quòd ibi sit antiqui hominis Calvaria condita, at secundi Adam, id est, Christi sanguis, de Cruce stillans, primi Adam & jacentis Protoplasti peccata diluerit.

and beautifie his tombe, when they knew not where he lay? Again, what if I ſay, That like as Gods eternall decree and determinate counſel being, that Chriſt ſhould die for our ſinnes, the Jews and Gentiles, Prieſts, Scribes and Phariſees, yet the devils themſelves were, for a while and a time, blinded, that they knew not, or would not know Chriſt to be the Meſſiah, though they had more evident miraculous proofs of his working, then could be of a buriall-place, ſo long fore-paſſed, as Adams was, but put him to death, Act. 2. 23. and chap. 3. 17. So Gods eternall decree, that Chriſt ſhould be crucified in the execution-place of malefactours, and in the place of Adams ſepulchre, being (perhaps) to this end, to manifeſt, that Chriſts bloud did waſh and purge ſinne originall, ſinne actuall, Adam and notorious offenders, with all and all manner of perſons; and all, and all kinde of ſinnes; the people were alſo blinded, that either they did not know, or not reſpect the place of Adams buriall; eſpecially ſince God often caſts in their teeth Adams diſobedience, and compared their ſinnes to his; *They, like Adam, have tranſgreſſed the covenant*, Hoſ. 6. 7. Where Druſius preferreth this reading with us, with Hierom, with Pagnine, and with Rabbi Solomon, the ordinarie Interpreter of the Hebrews, before the reading of Junius and Tremellius, and the Genevans. And Jerem. 32. 19. *Gods eyes were open to all the wayes of the ſonnes of Adam.* Which is alſo confirmed, Iſa. 43. 27. 2. Eſdr. 7. 11. Thus much in love of truth, againſt all oppoſites, with Pineda, for the common opinion of the Fathers, that Adam was buried on Golgotha. I adde, that if any of the Patriarchs aroſe bodily, Adam was one. For, upon other reaſons hereafter to be ſhewen, I dare not be ſo aſſertive, as the Liturgies of divers Churches, and as divers Fathers, who are expreſſe, that Adam was raiſed from his grave. See them cited by the learned James Uſher, Biſhop of Meath, in his anſwer to a challenge made by a Jeſuit, pag. 324. — which is the next point to be handled.

O Light inacceſsible, O Ancient of dayes, O Fulneſſe of knowledge, govern me walking in the paths of darknes, in things of old, in ambiguities and uncertainties of opinion, and keep me from ſingularitie of ſelf-preſuming; that I may keep the unitie of truth in the bond of peace, through him, who is both our Truth and our Peace, even Jeſus Chriſt the Righteous. Amen.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

1. Though Adam was buried on Calvarie, as Pineda ſaith, yet his proofs are weak, that Adam was raiſed with Chriſt, and went bodily into heaven with him. The cited place of Athanaſius proveth onely Adams buriall there. Origen, in the place cited, is againſt Pineda. Auguſtine is palpably falſified.

2. Adams ſkull ſhewed lately at Jeruſalem.

3. Dionyſius Carthuſianus ſaith, Eve then aroſe. His opinion is without proof.

4. Nor Abraham then aroſe.

5. Nor Iſaac then aroſe, whatſoever Pineda affirmeth.

1. BUt the ſecond part of Pineda his opinion, on Job the 19. 25. I cannot like, though he laboureth to prove it, partly by authoritie, partly by reaſon; That thoſe many, who aroſe about the time of Chriſts Paſſion, aſcended bodily into heaven with him. As Authours, he citeth Athanaſius in his Sermon on the Paſſion and the Croſſe, Origen, &c. That Adam was buried on Golgotha, Athanaſius ſaith; but that Adam aroſe not long after Chriſts reſurrection, I cannot finde in him, or cited by any other out of him. As for Origen his ſecond Authour, in the ſame Tractate cited by Pineda, he maketh directly againſt him: for he maintaineth from Tradition, that the firſt Adam was buried where Chriſt was crucified: that as in Adam all die, ſo in Chriſt all ſhould be made alive: that in the place of a skull, the head of mankinde (namely Adam) *Reſurrectionem inveniat cum populo univerſo, Should partake of the generall reſurrection*, by the reſurrection of our Lord and Saviour, who there ſuffered and roſe again. But the laſt and beſt Authour, the divine S. Auguſtine, is palpably and apparently falſified: for he hath no ſuch word in the quoted place. Laſtly, the reaſon that Pineda alledgeth is ſhallow, That Adam who heard the ſentence of death, ſhould preſently be partaker of the reſurrection by him, and with him, who had ſatisfied for the ſinne. What likelihood is there of inference or coherence? I dare ſay, not one of the Fathers cited at large by Baronius, Salianus, and Maldonate, to prove that Adam was buried in Golgotha, do

give the least touch at this reason of Pineda; but many other ends of Adams being there buried do they muster up.

2. And the Jesuite Pineda, either knew it not, or forgot it, or sleeked it over, as little imagining we should have notice that the cheating priests, who kept the sepulchre, and the Church built over it, at Jerusalem, did shew to the devout Christians a skull, which they said was the skull of Adam: of which, they said also, the mountain was called *Golgotha*, as saith the eye and eare-witnesse, Mr. Fines Morison, in his first part, 3. book, 2. chap. pag. 230. and pag. 233. Thus, according to them, Adam either arose not hitherto; or arose without a head, at least without his skull; or with an other mans head: which three latter wayes destroy the truth of the resurrection. Therefore he arose not at all as yet. Lastly, should we grant that Adam did bodily arise with Christ; yet hath Pineda neither Authour nor reason, that Adam ascended with Christ into heaven (as I said before) which is the main point now in question. Thus much (if not too much) touching Adam.

3. Eve also arose; saith Dionysius Carthusianus on Matth. 27. but voucheth no authoritie, nor produceth any reason, or probabilitie: and therefore I passe it over the more slightly; adding onely this, that in the Original it is not, πᾶν ἀρσεν, but πᾶν ἄρσεν so that except ἀνθρωπων be understood, either no women arose; or more then one or two; though Pineda mentioneth not one woman; and Carthusian, but onely and soly Eve. But why Eve should rather arise, then Sarah, or the mother of Moses, who were singled out for famous *Heroina*, Hebr. 11. or other Prophetisses, in the Old and New Testament, as old Anna, and the like, I see no reason: or that Eve in her raised bodie, should be translated into heaven, and not Adam her husband, nor Abraham, nor David, is both foolish and fabulous. This have I said, as supposing the words to be understood of women alone, as indeed they are not; nor probably can they be applied to women mixt with men, so far as any likelihood could present it self to the great conjecturer Pineda, who would have balked none of them.

4. Abraham arose, saith Pineda on Job 19. and annexeth this colour, because *Abraham rejoyced to see Christs day, and saw it, and was glad*, John 8.56. I answer, Whatsoever is meant by these words of the Text, *My day*: either Christs Godhead, which Abraham saw; * *Because he acknowledged the mysterie of the Trinitie*, saith S. Augustine: Or the day of Christs nativitie, which Abraham might have notice of in his life time, by supernaturall inspirations; and then did remember, being dead, and desired that day (for, separated souls have both remembrance and appetite intellectuall, as I shall evidence hereafter)

* *Quia mysterium Trinitatis agnovit.*

Or it may be, Abraham being in blisse, might first know it, by divine illumination, so soon as the day came, and thereupon rejoyced, as the Angel did, and the heavenly host, Luke 2. 13. of which host, Abraham might be one: for, *even the souls of men are also called* ἄγγελοι *Angels*, Revel. 19. 14. saith Gregory, Moral. 31. 12. In the foresaid place of Luke mention is made of an Angel and the heavenly host, whereas, if onely Angels were the heavenly host, it might have been onely said, *The Angels*: or onely, *The heavenly host*: but, *The Angel* and *the heavenly host* may give us cause to think, that there were some of the heavenly host, which were not Angels, though Angels onely be mentioned. If so, humane souls were part of that quire: and then Abraham, in likelihood, was one of them. Now, as the chief Angel, like a chaunter, began the Evangelisme of Christs birth, so might it be answered by the heavenly host, *etc.* (as is probable) partly by the Angels singing *Glory to God in the highest*; partly by Abraham, and the souls of men, concluding the Anthem, *On earth peace, good will toward men*. I say, Whatsoever is meant by the words *My day*, they cannot be expounded of Christs resurrection.

Some there are, who interpret *My day*, of the time of Christs passion; whom Maldonate justly misliketh, *because* (saith he) *it is added*, Abraham saw it, and rejoyced: *but then, when Christ said these words, Abraham could not see Christs passion, because it was not yet come*. I may say the same or more, against Pineda, who will have it expounded of the day of Christs resurrection: for, Christ speaketh of the day that was past, he *did see it*, he *was glad*, and *rejoyced*: so that day was ended, when Christ said this: but Christs resurrection was not accomplished, when he uttered these words: therefore they cannot be understood of Christs resurrection. And if they were so to be interpreted, yet it is not written, *Abraham arose*, or *Abraham was partaker with Christ*, or *Abraham ascended bodily into heaven* (this being the issue, which we joyned, in this controversie:) but, *Abraham rejoyced, he saw it, and was glad*: which words differ farre from Pineda his ridiculous interpretation.

5. *Another, which rose at the same time, was Isaac* (saith Pineda, ibid.) *for he was a parable of the resurrection, and this was done, to recompense the fear* (*which possessed Isaac*) *of being slain, when he represented Christ*.

To this *punctо* I answer; Pineda himself will not say, that every one, who was a parable, or pledge of the resurrection, or who figured it, was raised, as Samson from his sleep, arising in strength, and carrying away the gates of Azzah, in type of Christ, who brought away the gates both of death and hell: or those, who were raised by the Prophets, or by Christ himself, or

the like; for he mentioneth none of theſe. Secondly, what proof, what conſequence, what ſhadow of truth is there, that Iſaac his fear, which was paſt (he being dead one thouſand ſeven hundred yeares before) ſhould juſt now be recompenſed, and recompenſed by being raiſed to a temporall life: which was a poore reward, if he aſcended not into heaven; which Pineda proveth not, nor can prove. Laſtly, though it be truth it ſelf, that Jacob *ſware by the feare of his father Iſaac*, Geneſ. 31. 53. yet it is not meant, as Pineda fancieth, the fear that Iſaac was in, when he was to be offered. For (I ſuppoſe) he knew by Abraham; that it was Gods eſpeciall appointment; and that he alſo willingly offered himſelf; and might think (as Abraham did) *that God was able to raiſe him up even from the dead*; Hebr. 11. 19. that in his voluntarie condeſcent, and free-will-offering, he might be a type of Chriſt, who *layed down his life*, John 10. 17. But the fear of Iſaac was either the filial fear, by which Iſaac reverenced & worſhipped God, (as Aben Ezra and Cajetan ſay) or the pious and humane fear, wherewith Jacob revered his father Iſaac: or ratheſt of all, *Fear* is here taken for the object of fear, Metonymically, for God himſelf: as it is alſo taken, Eſa. 8. 13. *Let God be your fear; let God be your dread*; as Cornelius Cornelii à lapide hath obſerved, after Auguſtine, and divers others: for, not Iſaac his fright, or Jacob his pietie, is to be ſworn by, but *God*, Deuter. 6. 13.

O God, the God of Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob, the God of the living, and not of the dead; I beſeech thee, make me to die to my ſelf, and live to thee, through him, whom the Fathers looked for, and whoſe day Abraham rejoyced to ſee, even Jeſus Chriſt, thy onely Sonne, my alone Saviour. Amen.

CHAP. VIII.

1. *Pineda his fancie, that Jacob then was raiſed.*

2. *The reaſon, why the Patriarchs deſired the Tranſlation of their bones, was not, to riſe with Chriſt, as Pineda opineth; but upon other grounds, and to other ends.*

3. *Where Joſeph was firſt buried, where ſecondly.*

4. *The great difficultie of* Act. 7. 16. *propounded. Two anſwers diſliked. The original is not corrupt.*

5. *Beza taxed for imputing corruption to the original, on* Mat. 13. 35. *and on* Luk 22. 20. *and on* Matth. 27. 9. *All theſe places*

places defended, and the sacred Majestie of Scripture, vindicated from criticisme. Many good answers to Matth. 27. 9. Erasmus faulty with Beza.

6. S. *Augustine and Cyrill against them.*

7. *Masius and Junius prefer the Arabick and Syriack before the Greek. Junius recanteth. A little errour may (perhaps) be ascribed to the Transcribers. A generall errour in Greek and Latine may not be admitted in all copies of Scriptures.*

1. *Iacob then also arose*, saith Pineda in the same place; *since he had a great care of translating his bones, out of Egypt, into the land of Canaan*, Genes. 49. 29. By the same reason, the Jesuit might have argued, that Joseph then also arose: for he had the like care of his bones, Genes. 50. 25. yea a greater care: for he took a strict oath (Exod. 13. 19.) of the children of Israel, for the performance of his desire; whereas Jacob put Joseph onely to the oath; and concerning the rest of his children, it was but a fatherly command. Yet Pineda skippeth over Joseph, who was a lively parable and figure of Christ in most things; as being the best beloved of his father; as being sent to look to his brethren; as hated of them and sold by them, and put into the pit, as thrust into the dungeon; as being innocent, and falsly accused; as being taken *out of the pit*, Genes. 37. 28. and *out of the dungeon*, Genes. 41. 14. as raised, and raised to be next to Pharaoh himself; as being worshipped by his brethren; as having the double portion of the first-born; as a mediatour for his brethren, and a preserver of them in the time of need.

2. But the truth is, neither Jacob, nor Joseph ever desired the removal of their bones, in that regard, which Pineda aimeth at: and never any (that I could reade) but he, and the Authour of the scholasticall historie, *Quæst.* 100 *in Genes.* averre so much: it being against reason; for then the Patriarchs would have caused their bones to have been translated to Jerusalem, being the right way from Hebron to Calvarie, or to mount Calvarie itself. But Jacob was buried by Hebron, thirtie miles, or thereabout, from Golgotha; and Joseph was buried in the Tribe of Ephraim, and not of Judah. Now as they were to passe from the land of Goshen to Sychem, they must passe not farre from Hebron; and from thence neare to Jerusalem; and leaving Jerusalem and mount Calvarie but a little, the way was to Sychem, in the Tribe of Ephraim. Therefore, if they desired to be translated, in hope of such a resurrection with Christ, (as Pineda wildely imagineth) they would never have carried their bones close by mount Calvarie, and so beyond it, but there would have

have depoſited them: nor would have tranſported them to Sychem, which was about as farre beyond the ſepulchre of the firſt and ſecond Adam, as Hebron, the buriall-place of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, was ſhort of mount Calvarie. Their aim was to be buried in the land of Canaan, as the land of promiſe, as the figure of heaven, as the ground which their Fathers bought and payd for, and were interred in. *I will lie with my Fathers, and thou ſhalt carrie me out of Egypt, and bury me in their burying-place*, ſaith Jacob, Geneſ. 47.30. and *bury me with my Fathers*, Geneſ. 49. 29. ſaith the ſame Jacob. Beſides, if with reference to Chriſt his reſurrection, and in hope to be then and there raiſed by him and with him, they removed their bones into Canaan; it was to be neare to Chriſts riſing-place, and to ſave part of the long journey from Goſhen to Golgotha. But this can be no reaſon; for *Job aroſe*, ſaith Pineda: but he was buried in the land of Hus, in Arabia, not neare unto Calvarie, though not ſo farre indeed as Goſhen. And Moſes died in the wilderneſſe; and Daniel in the captivitie of Babylon; which was farther off, then the land of Goſhen, from Chriſts ſepulchre, by almoſt five hundred miles; and yet *Daniel and Moſes aroſe alſo*, ſaith Pineda. And Noah died hard by mount Ararat in Armenia, 600 miles North-ward from Jeruſalem, or thereabout: yet *Noah alſo aroſe*, ſaith Pineda. Now, why could not Jacob and Joſeph be raiſed, and come a ſhorter way, from Goſhen to Jeruſalem, then Daniel or Noah could a longer way? And to beat Pineda with his own words, [a] *Were they terrified or wearied with the tedioufneſſe of the way, who enjoyed an immortall life; that they could not come fitly from ſo remote a region?* Or, *can they be truelier ſaid to come into a place, into the holy citie, that come from neare, then they that come from farre?* This Pineda alledgeth, to prove that the graves of Saints opened afarre off, as well as at Jeruſalem: Therefore ſay I, What need they care to have their bones brought neare to Golgotha, to that end and purpoſe?

3 Concerning Joſeph, *he was firſt buried on an high ground, upon a little branch of Nilus, in a citie now called* EL-RIUM (ſaith John Leo, upon report, in his eighth book of the hiſtorie of Africa) *and Moſes digged up his bones.* Secondly, it is ſaid expreſly, Joſh. 24. 32. *the children of Iſrael buried his bones in Sychem, in a parcel of ground which Jacob bought of the ſonnes of Hemor, the father of Sychem, for an hundred pieces of ſilver; and it became the inheritance of the children of Joſeph.* On which place, Maſius inquiring, *why holy men ſhould ſo earneſtly contend to be buried in Canaan*, anſwereth himſelf, [b] *To confirm their countrie-mens mindes by the promiſes of God, with ſuch a faith, as death ſhould not take away.* Whereunto I adde the place of the Apoſtle, Heb. 11. 22. *By faith Joſeph, when he died, made mention of the departing of the children of Iſrael; and gave commandment concerning his bones;*

[a] *Numquid laſſitudine viæ deterrerentur & fatigarentur, qui immortali vitâ potiebantur; at venire ex regione longinqua opportunè non poſſent?*

[b] *Ut apud ſuorum populariũ animos fidem promiſſi Dei firmarent, qualem ne mors quidem eripere potuiſſet.*

bones, making the removing of his bones, and the memoriall thereof, a divine prognostick, that they should come forth of the Egyptian captivitie or slavery, and enjoy the land promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; of which their bones, and their wives bones, before-hand did, and Joseph his bones should take seizen and possession. Rimke saith (and Masius likes it) that Jacob gave to Joseph this place of buriall, because he being, as it were, the Parent, Monitour, and Guide of his brethren, should be wholly alienated from Egyptian affaires, to think of the land of promise. And since Masius taxeth the Jews for thinking, that they who were buried in Canaan should first arise, he would have laughed at Pineda, if he had read in him, that a Patriarch caused his bones to be translated, in hope to be raised within a while of Christs resurrection. *Each of these Fathers were solemnly brought into their own possession* (saith the same Masius:) which is thus confirmed, because *Abraham did bury Sara in his own possession*, Genes. 23. 19, 20. *Isaac and Ishmael buried Abraham in the field which Abraham purchased of the sonnes of Heth*, Genes. 25. 9, 10. And to summe up the rest, *In the cave that is in the field of Machpelah, (the purchased cave and field) which is before Mambre, was buried Abraham and Sara, Isaac and Rebeka, Jacob and Lea*, Genes. 49. 30, 31. The distance of which cave or field from Calvarie, I gathered before, from Adrichomius, to be 250 *Stadia*, which, upon allowance of eight *Stadia* to one Mile, amounteth to one and thirty miles, and a quarter: from which account S. Augustine differeth but little, considering the various reckoning of miles, with the diverse measurings of beginnings and endings: for, Augustine, *Quæst. sup. Genes. lib. 1. quæst. 161.* thus reporteth, [d] *From the place called Abrahamium, or Abrahams church-yard, where are these bodies*, (namely of Abraham and Sara, Isaac and Rebeka, Jacob and Leah) *to the place where our Lord was crucified, there is almost thirty miles distance.* Now, as the sepulchre of the three Patriarchs was thus farre from Jerusalem, South-west-ward, so Sychem, where Joseph his bones were buried, was farther from Jerusalem, toward the North.

[c] *Solenne autem fuit priscis illis Patribus, ut quisque in suam inferretur possessionem.*

[d] *Dicunt, ab eo loco, quod* ABRAHAMIUM *vocatur, ubi sunt ista corpora, abesse locum, ubi crucifixus est Dominus, ferè triginta millibus.*

4 One difficultie more there is, and a great one: I may not passe it; for the length will be recompensed by the sweetnesse. Acts 7. 15, 16. *Jacob, and our fathers died, and were carried over unto Sychem, and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a summe of money of the sonnes of Emor the father of Sychem.* Which passage seemeth to contradict what out of other parts of Scripture I proved concerning the Patriarchs sepulchre.

That this is a knot hard to be untied, all confesse. S. Hierom promised in his 101 Epist. to clear it, saith Lorinus: And in his Questions on Genes. saith Bera: but he hath not performed his promise, say both of them, on Acts 7. Vide ne tu Hieronimus,

mus, nec eum dissolvit, saith Erasmus. And *I thinke propound it*, saith he, *that the studious reader may be stirred up to discusse it*. But this is a shallow slurre, unfit for so great a Critick; for many had done so much before, and more then so. I come to the point.

That there are invented many wayes, and means of answering, cannot be denied: but some are vaine and improbable; some more fair and expedite. The absurd answers are two. The first, That the Originall is there corrupt; and that, for Abraham, Jacob is to be written and read: I say, not meant, expounded, or interpreted, but exchanged and intruded into the Text; and that; ἀβραὰμ, should be expunged, as needlesse; *it being with equall ignorance and boldnesse added by one to other*, saith Andrew Masius on Josh. 24. 32. With Masius agreeth Beza in this, that the name of *Abraham* is crept into the Text, adding, that *the erring, in notes of number, or proper names, must not be ascribed to the Authours; but to the ignorant transcribers*. But I say, that the erring in a proper name, or notes of number, may breed as great and unsufferable confusion, unlikelihood, inconvenience, yea untruth, as the errour in any other common word. And why the errours in proper names should be ascribed to ignorant transcribers, rather then errours in other words; or that the holy Spirit doth priviledge other words, and not proper names, or numbers, from being mistaken, misplaced, misadded, or superadded in the Text, I see not.

Aretius bluntly blundereth it out, that you must understand *Jacob* for *Abraham*: yet by what example, or for what reason, he mentioneth not: but stumbleth on a truth; of which hereafter.

Drusius, *Praterit. lib.* 5. on the words *Quod emit Abraham*, hath yet some shew of reason. *It seemeth* (saith he) *it was sometimes written*, ΕΜΙΤ ΙΑΚΩΒ, *that is* JACOB, *into whose place the name of* ABRAHAM *is crept*.

5. Beza defends it by two parallels; the first out of Hierom, who in his book *de optimo genere interpretandi, ad Pammachium*, noteth, that the name of *Isaiah* was crept into many copies, on Matth. 13. 35. that afterward, the name of *Asaph* was substituted for *Isaiah*; and now neither of them is there read.

I answer to the misapplied instances of Beza, that I cannot abide to hunt after errours in the Scripture, and to cast aspersions on it. To question the corruption of the Canon, to passe our judgements, whether the square or rule be right or crooked, to put into the Text, or to take from it, as some Philologizing Neotericks endeavour in their super-nice criticisme, is to tear up the very foundation of religion. Whilest other answers may be found, though but probable, I should not have such a thought, as Beza had, on Luk. 24. 13. where he acknowledgeth, both the Syriack, and all our Copies have it ἑξήκοντα, *Sexaginta*, *Three-*

Threescore, and the exact truth is accordant to that reading: for Emaus is seven miles from Jerusalem, as M^r Sands (who rode from Jerusalem to Emaus) witnesseth, pag. 174. and threescore *Stadia* (allowing eight *Stadia* to a mile) make seven miles and an half, which halfe-mile, upon diversitie of measures, or the beginning of measuring, or ends thereof, maketh small difference. Yet Beza saith, *Aut hîc peccatum est in numero, aut apud Josephum, de Bello Judaico 7.27. non recte scribuntur stadia triginta.* The more favourable phrase should have been by Beza ascribed rather to the Scripture, then to Josephus. Or can we think, that all Copies do erre? He maketh us fight upon the ice, and to have no firm footing. Why should he use the first part of the disjunction, when he might better distinguish, and so reconcile all? Likewise Beza, on Luke 22.20. confessing the uniformitie of reading, both in the Syriack, and all the Greek Copies which he had seen; yet addeth boldly, *Aut manifestum est solœcophanes,--aut potius, cùm hæc essent ad marginem annotata ex Matthæo, & Marco, postea in Contextum irrepserunt.* Now, though he would sleek it over afterwards, saying, *Potest excusari solœcismus, &c.* yet the wound, which he gave to the Word of Truth is too deep, to be so healed; and the very plaister is offensive: for he committed a solœcisme, who looking on the *earth*, cried out, *O Cælum!* and casting his eyes up to *heaven*, cried, *O Terra!* Had the Reverend Beza no handsomer word for his plaister? might he not have defended it, by the Hebrew Idiotisme, without calling it a Solœcisme? *Solœcophanes* might have well been spared: but *Solœcismus* is not to be endured.

Much more might be said: but I dwell unwillingly on this point; and return to the first place of Matth. 13. 35. and say, Who ever denyed, but that some Copies have been corrupted? and in some of them, some words foisted in? but all Greek, all Latine Copies, with the Arabick and Syriack translations, reade *Abraham*, and not *Jacob*: Whereas some Copies were alwayes perfect, in that place of Matthew. Now, if you grant corruption in any point, or title, in all the Greek, and all the Latine Copies, how will you prove any part or word of the New Testament to be uncorrupt? Which razeth up the very Corner-stone of our Faith.

M^r Beza again objecteth, that the name of *Jeremie* is written for *Zacharie*, Matth. 27.9. I answer, that the Authour of the book of Maccabees, giveth us to understand, that Jeremie wrote other things, which now we have not, 2. Maccab. 2.1. and so did divers of the Prophets: and why may not this be then taken from some of those works, which are perished? Secondly, S. Hierome saith, a Jew brought him an Apocryphall book of Jeremie, in which he found this testimonie,

word for word; and *this book was called* Apocrypha, or Occulta Jeremiæ, *The Apocryphals or hid writings of Jeremie*, saith Erasmus on Matth. 27. As what S. Paul saith of Jannes and Jambres, 2. Tim. 3. 8. and what S. Jude saith of Michael the Archangel, striving with the Devil, is thought to be taken out of the books Apocryphall: so might this testimonie be cited also out of Jeremies Apocryphals. Thirdly, Erasmus supposeth, that Zacharie had two names, and was called both Zacharie and Jeremie; and so no inconvenience followeth. Fourthly, not only the Syriack leaves out the name of Jeremie, but even in Augustines time, the name of Jeremie was not in many Latine Copies, as Augustine himself testifieth; *de Consensu Evangelistarum lib. 3. cap. 7.* The ordinarie glosse also saith, that in some editions, it is onely thus, *By the Prophet*, and the name of Jeremie is left unmentioned. Fifthly, Augustine in the last recited place of his, resolveth, that the Divine providence purposely set down *Jeremie* for *Zacharie*, and what the holy Spirit did dictate, S. Matthew did truely write. And *one reason why the Spirit of God confounded the names of Jeremie and Zacharie, was this*, saith Augustine, *To insinuate, that all the Prophets wrote by one Spirit, and wonderfully consented in one; and therefore we must beleeve that What the holy Ghost spake by them is not to be appropriated unto any one, but to all and every of them.* What was said by Jeremie, was as well Zacharies, as Jeremies; and what was said by Zacharie, was as well Jeremies as Zacharies. God spake, not *by the* mouths; but, *by the* mouth *of all his holy Prophets, since the world began*, Act. 3. 21. and they had but one Spirit to guide them into all truth. The Prophesie of Amos, is called *The book of the Prophets*, Acts 7. 42. and the Word of God, which in divers places is called, in the plurall number, *Scriptures*, (as John 5. 39. Ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, *Search the Scriptures*) is also often times called, in the singular number, *The Scripture*: as John 2. 22. *they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.* Beleef was to rest, as well on his Word onely, without Scripture, as on Scripture, though he had said nothing: and the word *Scripture* is not to be restrained onely to that place of Scripture before pointed at, but to the whole Word of God written, which they believed. *The Scripture hath concluded all under sinne*, Gal. 3. 22. where not one single place onely, but either common places of that point, or the whole bodie of the Scripture is to be understood. A few words of a Psalme of David, is called by Christ himself, *The Law of the Jews, it is written in their law; They hated me without a cause*, John 15. 25. which is onely so written, Psal. 35. 19. Again, he saith to the Jews, John 10. 34. *Is it not written in your Law, I have said, ye are Gods?* but it is written so onely, Psal. 82. 6. Yea, though one and the same thing in effect be

written,

c *Quæcunque per eos Spiritus Sanctus dixit, & singula esse omnium, & omnia singulorum.*

written, both Isa. 28. 16. and Psal. 118. 22. as also Matth 21. 42. and Acts 4. 12. yet S. Peter reckoneth all, but as one; All, but one Scripture, though severally written by these foure: *It is contained in the Scripture*, (saith he) 1. Pet. 2. 6. in the singular number, he mentioneth Scripture, as if what one wrote the rest wrote. S. Peter saith not, It is contained in the Word, with reference to one Spirit inditing or inspiring, (though that might have also been truely spoken) but contained in the Scripture, with relation to the unity and consent of the Pen-men. Lastly, the words of the Evangelist are these, Matth. 27. 9. *Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by the Prophet Jeremie, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver; τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, effatum Jeremiæ, dicentis, That which was spoken by Jeremie, saying, &c.* Now Jeremie might say it, speak it, dictate it, which is most true, and is all that S. Matthew saith, who by the Spirit might also know, that Jeremie did teach, preach, prophesie, and utter these words: and yet for all this, and after all this, Zacharie by the same Spirit might write, transcribe, and insert those words of Jeremie into his own Prophesie (which S. Matthew denieth not) as Baruch wrote divers things which he had heard from Jeremie; as Agur collected some Proverbs of Solomon. Again, there was no necessitie that all things whatsoever Jeremie, as a Prophet, did speak, g he himself or Baruch should write, much lesse presently: since there were many yeares between Jeremie his speaking and his writing, for Enoch prophesied, as it is in the 14. verse of the Epist. of S. Jude; but he prophesied, *Saying, &c.* as it is there written: for writing was none, till God set the Copie unto Moses, by writing the Law in the Tables on the mount.

g Jerem. 36. 2.

Again, S. Paul (Act. 24. 35.) remembreth the words of our Lord Jesus, how he said, *It is more blessed to give, then to receive*: yet none of the Evangelists record such words: but this might the Apostles relate unto S. Paul, or by divine inspiration he might know that Christ spake them, or they might be part of the words which Christ himself spake unto S. Paul: for there is no certaintie, that they were written. S. John the Evangelist was commanded to conceal, and not to write, the words of the seven thunders, Revel. 10. 4. If he had wholly concealed such a thing, we could not know it: he spake it, but wrote it not. Jeremie might speak this, and not write it, or write it, and not speak it. Any of these answers is better, then to incline to Beza, that the Text is erroneous, or patched up with a false addition, or to Erasmus, on Matth. 27. intimating, there was *lapsus memoriæ in Evangelistis*: howsoever he qualifieth it, That, if there were *memoriæ lapsus, in Novitios dumtaxat*, he did think no man should be so morose, nosy, and stern, as thence to question the authoritie of the whole Scriptures.

But his opinion is justly exploded as hypercritically nice, and Julius Scaligers whip here fetcheth bleud of Erasmus, *Maximus esse potuisset, si minor esse voluisset.* He diminisheth himself, by taking upon him to be a *censor* of the Scripture. *Nihil parturiens, continuò parit omnia,* saith a Papist of Erasmus.

6. Wiser S. Augustine, in Epist. 19. ad Hieronymum, thus; [h] *I have learned to give that reverence and honour onely to those books of Scripture which are called Canonicall, that I most fully beleeve, no writer thereof erred any Iota.* But if there were *a fail of their memory*, they did *somewhat erre*, whatsoever Erasmus should seem to suggest; who would have taken it in fume, if the Friers his opposites had said, there had been in his books *lapsus memoriæ, A fail of memorie.* S. Augustine is constant to himself, and to the truth: for again he saith, concerning the Evangelists, [i] *The Evangelists must be so farre from lying, that they must not fall into an untruth of forgetfulnesse.* S. Cyril. *lib. 6. in Levitic.* toward the end of his book, ascending from one particular, saith of the whole Scripture, divinely inspired, [k] *What shall we say? shall we grant forgetfulnesse in the words of the holy Ghost?* And he answereth his own question, in generall, [l] *I dare not think so of the sacred Text.*

Yea, but saith Masius, *The Syriack translation proves, that this place is faulty: for the Syriack Copies have it thus, Jacob was translated into Sychem, and laid in the grave that Abraham bought for money of the sonnes of Hemor.* Junius his Syriack accordeth with Masius; and on that place Junius thus, *The Syriack Interpreter either used a diverse Copie, or his own judgement and authoritie.* Lastly, the Arabick translation, as it is set out by Junius, readeth it correspondently to the Syriack: and Junius on the Text, in the Arabick translation, preferreth the Arabick and Syriack reading before the Greek; and the meaning of the Arabick and Syriack is this, That Jacob being dead, was carried into the field of the Sychemites; the Egyptians accompanying Joseph, and the Israelites, where *septendialis luctus, Seven dayes mourning* was made; and after the mourning he was carried again from Sichem to Hebron, to be buried with Abraham. *This is wittily invented,* (saith Beza) *yet not to be admitted.* And indeed, Junius himself in his Parallels retracts it: and Chorographie sheweth, it is no wittie invention. For Hebron lieth between Goshen and Sichem: now that they should carry him from Goshen, even almost through Hebron, it is not likely. Wherefore, to conclude, neither be the Arabick or Syriack Copies of authoritie enough to confront the Greek (for the Greek was not translated out of them, but they out of the Greek) neither may we yeeld, that either the Evangelists did *labi memoriâ, fail in their memories*, or that generally, in any place, all the Greek and Latine Copies are corrupted. If it had been a

[h] *Ego solis eis Scripturarum libris, qui jam Canonici appellantur, timorem hunc, & honorem didici deferre, ut nullum eorum autorem scribendo aliquid errâsse firmissimè credam.*

[i] *Omnem falsitatem abesse ab iis decet, non solum eam quæ mentiendo promitur, sed eam etiam quæ obliviscendo.*

[k] *Quid dicemus? Oblivionem dabimus in verbis Spiritus Sancti?*

[l] *Non audeo hoc de sacris sentire sermonibus.*

literall

literall errour (as Geneſ. 3.15. the Vulgat readeth *ipſa*, for *ipſe* or *ipſum*, or *Dei*, for *diei*, in Epiſt. Jude, verſ. 6. or *lapides ſeculi*, for *lapides ſæculi*, Proverb. 16.11. or *viduam ejus*, for *victum ejus*, Pſal. 132.15. or *fontem*, for *fortem*, Pſal. 42.2.) we would yeeld it was the fault of the tranſcriber: but to admit ſuch a corruption, wherein is no ſimilitude of letters, and in all Copies, both Greek and Latine, I cannot like, though more Authours, then Maſius, Beza, Druſius, or Eraſmus, did joyn hand in hand to juſtifie it.

O Infinite Spirit, unſearchable, yet ſearching all things; Ommipotent, yet unable to lie or be untrue; who never didſt lead into errour thy holy Inſtruments, nor ſufferedſt the Penmen of thy ſacred Scripture to take thy Dictates amiſſe; I humbly beſeech thee to inſpire me with knowledge and zeal, to vindicate thy heavenly Word, and the moſt bleſſed Writers thereof, from imputed corruption, miſtaking, or obliviouſneſſe. Grant this, at the Mediation of my onely Lord and Redeemer, Jeſus Chriſt. Amen.

CHAP. IX.

1. *The ſecond anſwer diſliked. Melchior Canus cenſured for ſaying, S. Steven his memorie failed him. His like proof from Jephthah his miſtaking, anſwered.*

2. *An other argument of his, from* Matth. 2. 6. *anſwered.*

3. *Heinſius touched at, Cuſanus rejected, for holding that Adam could have underſtood all languages now in uſe. The manner of the confuſion of tongues at Babel.*

4. *The Oriental languages, a goodly ornament, and neceſſary in ſome places. The Syriack enlightening the Greek.*

5. *The Jewiſh excommunications. Donations to Religious houſes ſealed up with curſes to the infringers. Mr. Selden in part defended, though his Hiſtorie of Tithes hath done hurt. Maran-atha. The Amphibologie of Act. 2.21. cleared by the Syriack. Ubiquitaries with Illyricus taxed. Heavens, and Heaven, taken for God.*

6. *Heinſius ſtrictly examined, and rejected.*

7. *Things granted: viz. The inſpirations and conceptions of*

holy Pen-men were ready one or other language in which conceptions they could not erre, nor could they erre in writing.

8. Questions handled at large. Whether it were necessary that the Scripture should be written: Whether the sacred writers wrote casually: Whether they were commanded to write: Whether they were compelled to write: Whether they understood all that they wrote: Whether they did reade prophane Authours: Whether they studied the things beforehand.

9. Conclusions against Heinsius. There was no difference between the Pen-men of the Divine writ of the Old and New Testament, in the point of conceiving and writing in different languages. We are not to have recourse to the thoughts of S. John, rather then his words. They had no libertie left them, to put in their own conceits, or in writing to adde or blot out what they had done. They had no libertie to cloath their inward apprehensions with words of their own. They did not conceive in one language, and write in another.

1 THus then, the constant and uniform accordance of the Greek and Latine Copies being held for Authenticall and Canonicall, and all manner of corruption and generall aberration in any one letter being wholly removed; there is invented a second way of answer, grosse and absurd; which I dislike as ill, if not worse then the former. A defender of it is Melchior Canus, *de Locis Theologicis, lib. 2. cap. 18.* toward the end of that book and chapter. For he would seem to gather from Beda and Rabanus, *That it happened to Steven, as to other common people; namely, that in a long narration, especially if it be sudden, he hath mingled and confounded some things, [a] And forgot himself in some things, to wit, in such things as belonged little or nothing to the purpose: for he was busily musing, and intent upon the main matter. But* (saith he) *S. Luke writing the historie, changed not one jot, but writ as Steven spake. Now we need not defend Steven from all errour and fault* (saith he) *but we must quit the Evangelist. For onely the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists, did never labi memoriâ, or erre in any matter, great or small, as other men did.* His proofs are these.

[a] *In quibusdam etiam memoriâ lapsus fuerit.*

Jephthah in Judges 11. 26. pretendeth 300 yeares possession, when they were not so many: and the divine Pen-man or Historiographer, writeth as Jephthah pretended, and established not the truth of the thing it self.

I answer, that Salianus, in his *Annales, Anno Mundi* 2849, maketh

keth one account, wherein the time of the Israelites coming out of Egypt, to the instant of Jephthahs arguing, is 377. yeares: and from the death of Sihon king of the Amorites, 337. yeares. But the truth is, (if we will hit the exact number) both Sulpitius and Tremellius, and many others say, That from the coming out of Egypt, and from the giving of the Law, unto this present controversie of Jephthah with the King of the Amonites, there were 305. or 306 yeares expired. And Tremellius well observeth, that Jephthah began his narration from their coming forth of Egypt, vers. 16. Therefore thence beginneth the number, and the reckoning. Now the shortning of an account, is an usuall Ellipsis, both in Scripture, and in other Authours. The 70 Interpreters are cited for 72. Among the Romanes, the *Centumviri* consisted of one hundred and five men. Judges 20. 46. *All which fell of Benjamin that day, were* 25000. yet there fell that day 100 more, vers. 35. So 2. Sam. 5. 5. the account is shortened by six moneths lesse then was set down in the precedent verse, it being [b] *A frequent Synecdoche, to make a round and smooth reckoning*, saith Tremellius. If any shall yet contend, that Jephthah saith expresly, v. 26. *Israel dwelt in Heshbon and her townes, and in Aroer and her townes, and in all the cities that be along by the coasts of Arnon*, 300 *yeares*; Peter Martyr on the place answereth, That the Scripture account often followeth the greater number. Now because the yeares from Sihons death, were neare 300. then 300. Jephthah reckoneth not the refuse, but the whole number; and accounteth them 300 yeares, as inclining to the greater number. For Sihon was overcome, and slain the last yeare of Moses his life; *being to the present debate*, 266 *yeares*, saith Abulensis, 267, saith Lyranus, 270 *yeares*, saith Peter Martyr. If Peter Martyrs answer be sleighted, I adde, that the perfection of Scriptures stands not so strictly on exactnesse of number, but that it puts a certain number for an uncertain. Instances are obvious. So, *while we plead too much for number, we shall*, as S. Augustine saith, *forget, or neglect, both weight and measure*. Lastly, grant that Jephthah either mistook, or misplaced the yeares, in a braving fashion; and say, that the holy Ghost hath penned, not what was truth in it self, but what Jephthah alledged erroneously, or covetously, for his prescription (for Jephthah had more then one errour:) yet, it followeth not, that S. Steven was deceived; for he was *full of the holy Ghost*, when he spake this, Act. 7. 55. and before he spake this, he was *full of faith, and of the holy Ghost*, Act. 6. 5. *Full of faith and power*, vers. 8. and they that disputed with Steven, *were not able to resist the wisdome and the Spirit, by which he spake*, v. 10. Therefore he spake wisely, truely, and by the Spirit, as well as S. Luke wrote by the Spirit, and neither of them could in this

[b] *Synecdoche frequens, ad rotundum & lene calculum.*

passage erre, though Jephthah be held a man of imperfections.

5. *Secondly*, saith Cajus, *the Evangelist hath it, Matth. 2. 6.* THOU BETHLEHEM, IN THE LAND OF JUDAH, ART NOT THE LEAST AMONG THE PRINCES OF JUDAH, *when it is not so written by the prophet, who saith, Micah 5. 2.* BUT THOU BETHLEHEM EPHRATA, THOUGH THOU BE LITTLE AMONG THE THOUSANDS OF JUDAH; *the sense being very different, almost contrary.* In which place S. Matthew reports the words, not as they are in Micah, but as the chief Priests and Scribes recited them to Herod. *Which testimonie* (saith Hierome on Micah 5. 2.) *agreeth neither with the Hebrew, nor the Seventie, as it plain, though I say nothing.* Then followeth his opinion, *I think that S. Matthew being willing to reprove the negligence of the Scribes and Priests, toward the reading of holy Scriptures, related the words, as they were cited by them.* So that though the Scribes and Pharisees were blinde, and, seeing the Prophet through a vail, took one thing for an other; and though the Evangelist purposely reciteth their mistaking, that we might discern the fault of these ill guides, and ignorant teachers, yet it no way followeth, that S. Steven did erre, or was mistaken, or that S. Luke misreported the words of S. Steven. But enough of this, to testifie my dislike of the second opinion, and of such, who excusing the Greek Text from corruption, (wherein I wonderfully applaud them) do impute an errour and slip unto the holy, powerfull, gracefull, truth-speaking, and dying Protomartyr S. Steven (which I cannot endure in them.) And certes, both these former rejected opinions are built on a false ground, and idlely do presuppose, that there is no reall historicall truth in the words, as they are in the Greek, and in the Latine Text. But truth there is, and though truth lie deep hid, *as in a well* (said he of old;) yet, by Gods help, we shall winde her up, and draw her above ground, that every eye may see her, though we have many turnings.

c *Quod testimonium nec Hebraico textui, nec 70 Interpretibus convenire, me quoque tacente, perspicuum est.* d *Arbitror, Matthæum volentem arguere Scribarum & Sacerdotum ergo divinæ Scripturæ lectionem negligentiam, sic etiam posuisse, ut ab illis dictum est.*

3. Which that I may the better accomplish, I must straggle awhile after two most learned men, Cardinall Cusanus, and Daniel Heinsius; especially Heinsius; whom when I have overtaken, and wrung and wonne from him some holds, which are offensive to the majestie of sacred Scripture, then shall I return, and descend to the most difficult place of Acts 7. 16, &c.

The learned worthie Heinsius (whom I name not without honour, though I dissent from him) in his Exercitations upon Nonnus, and in the *Prolegomena*, beats out certain paths, which never any on the earth trode upon, before him, pag. 27. making the Hellenisticall language to be the best interpreter of the Hebrew and Chaldee, and the Hebrew and Chaldee, interchangeably, the best interpreters of it.

Before

Before all his words or my answer be recited, I think fit to premise these things:

First, If Heinsius mean onely to extoll the knowledge of the Hellenisticall language, and of the Chaldee and Syriack; I assent unto him: nor shall any man, in right, ascribe more to the holy mother of them all, and of all other languages, the primitive Hebrew, the language of God (when he spake audibly) and of Angels, unto men, then I will. Yet the purest gold may be over-valued, and the very shekel of the Sanctuarie thought heavier then it is. And indeed I should be loath to say, what the most learned Cardinall Cusanus hath written in his *Compendium, cap. 3. pag. 240.* * *It is not absurd to beleeve, that the first art of speaking was so copious, and full of many Synonymues, that all the afterward divided tongues were in it contained. For all languages are derived from our first parent Adams language. And as there is not a tongue which man understandeth not; so even Adam (who was no other then a man) could understand any language if he heard it. For he was the inventor, who imposed names upon the creatures; and therefore no word of any other language was originally instituted by any other. Neither are we to wonder at this in Adam, when it is certain, that by the gift of God many have suddenly obtained, and speedily were inspired with the skill and knowledge of all languages.* So farre Cusanus.

That there is no language under heaven, but hath some words retaining the footsteps of the Hebrew, I beleeve; and in the languages which I understand, I can demonstrate: but that Adam could understand all languages now spoken, if he had heard them, is not credible. When God confounded their language, Genes. 11. 7. &c. *the language of all the earth*, he did it to this end, that they might not understand one anothers speech. The confusion was not of inventing of new letters, vowels, and consonants, (for they are still the same) and if there were seventie two languages, as say the Ancient Hierom, Augustine, Prosper, Epiphanius, or but fiftie five, (as our Modern writers conjecture) answerable to their families, Genes. 10. yea two thousand foure hundred languages more, they might all be understood by the first two and twentie letters. Nor was it onely such a confusion, as when the sweet singing of the nightingales is undistinguishable through the obstreperousnesse of gagling geese, and chattering daws: For if at the beginning of that confusion every one had spoken to another articulately and distinctly, *literis vicibus*, they could not have understood what either said, though afterward by use each familie understood themselves, as we may dumbe men. But the confusion consisted in this, That God took away from all, save the family of Heber, the habituall, or actuall knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, emptying the treasuries of their memories, both sensi-

* *Nec absurdum videtur, si creditur, primam dicendi artē adeò fuisse copiosam, ex multis Synonymis, quòd omnes postea linguæ diviſæ in ipsa continebātur. Omnes enim linguæ humanæ sunt ex prima illa parentis nostri, Adæ scilicet hominis, lingua. Et sicut non est lingua quam homo non intelligit, ità & Adam (qui idē quod homo) nullam, si audiret, ignoraret. Ipse enim vocabula legitur imposuisse; ideo nullum cujusque linguæ vocabulum ab alio fuit originaliter institutum. Nec de Adam mirandum, cùm certum sit, dono Dei, multos linguarum omnium peritiam subitò habuisse.*

sensitive and intellective, from all and every old note, impression, character, figure, or species.

Secondly, when by an universall deluge, or oblivion, he had drowned or blotted out all former conceptions; he prompted readily unto them new forms, and furnished their intellectualls with new notions; which the pliable obedience of the tongue (at first not knowing what it said) uttered in new words and languages; by the transposition and transchanging, adding or diminishing of a letter, or letters. So Avenarius, drawing almost all Greek, and out Minshaw, many languages from the Hebrew: but if they retained the same syllable, and the same word; yet in one language it signified one thing, and in another, another thing; as *sus* signifieth, in the Hebrew, an *horse*; with the Flaunderkins, *silence*; among the Latines, an *hogge*: as Cornelius à Lapide hath observed. Nor think I, that Noah (who lived at the confusion of Babel; and was born within seven score yeares of Adams death) could understand all their languages, without much commerce, studie, or divine revelation. Besides all this, all ages have made and framed new words; nor is any time to be blamed,

——— *si nova rerum*
Nomina protulerit, ——— *If it coyn new names:*

it was lawfull, and is yet, —— *dabitur que licentia sumpta pudenter, It shall be lawfull, so it be done modestly without enforcement*, saith Horace, *De arte Poetica*. And though there were but few yeares, about half a mans age, between the first and second Punick warre; yet the articles of peace made at the end of the first warre, were hardly understood at the second, as may be gathered from Polybius. What speak I of words, when new languages have sprung up, more then ever were at the confusion of Babel? If God at the overthrow of Babel coyned or stamped the Greek; and if Adam could have understood it; were all its dialects distinguished, or not? and the Hellenisticall Greek, or Grecanick language? (that I may use some of Heinsius his words.) And if those were then spoken, and then intelligible, was the now common corrupt Greek misformed? or could Adam understand that, which Plato or Aristotle would sweat to expound? If the Teutonick were then spoken, was the Saxon, English, Scotish, &c. (the derivatives from it, as Verstegan and others will have it) then in use? If the Latine was framed in Babel; was it the first old blunt Latine, or the refined? If the refined; was the Valachian, Italian, Spanish, French, (the Provinciall tongues of Rome, if I may so call them) in that time spoken? I could be plentifull herein. But I passe unto the objections of Cusanus, which shall receive this satisfaction in order.

Objected

Object. 1. *The first art of humane speech was copious by many Synonymes.*

I answer; The Hebrew had but few Synonymies, few primitive Radixes, in comparison of other languages; many words signifying contrary things, every one divers things: nor did Adam speak any but Hebrew, nor needed he know any more. Cicero cried out of old, * *O word-wanting Greece!* and much more Judea, say I.

* *O inops verborum Græcia!*

Object. 2. *All languages came from the Hebrew which Adam spake.*

I confesse it, *quoad fundamenta sermonum, id est, quoad literas.* There were no new letters stamped or added to the first: but the tongues themselves came after divers descents: so that many languages now in use may acknowledge other mothers; though even those mothers were grand-children, or daughters of the Hebrew: neither of which, by reason of the long tract of time, and the insensible degrees of their growing, could know one another, if they could meet.

Object. 3. *As there is no language but some man understandeth, so there is no language but Adam, who signifieth a man, could understand if he heard.*

I answer, The word *Adam* is homonymous, and the similitude unlike, and disjoynted.

Object. 4. *But Adam imposed names on all things: therefore no man else originally invented any other name.*

I answer, He saith true, if he confine his meaning to the Hebrew, to that *Origo originans.* But that Adam called Cheese, *Coise*; or Cartell, *Cavalla*; or a Chappel, *Capella*; a learned man should not think.

Object. 5. *Oh, but some, by Gods gift, had the knowledge of all tongues: then wonder not if Adam had.*

I answer, They had the gift of all tongues then necessarie to be spoken or understood; perchance of all tongues then in being: that as when people inclined to idolatrie, the diversitie of tongues was introduced; so when they were to be reconciled to Christ, the cloven tongues sitting on the Apostles, might finde a remedie for that diversitie, by the gift of languages. Yet saith Aquinas, 2ª. 2ª. quæst. 176. art. 1. and 1. [t] *The Apostles were taught from heaven the languages of all nations, so farre forth as was requisite for the doctrine of faith, but for point of elegancie, the Apostles were onely skilfull in their own tongue. As in wisdome and knowledge they were sufficiently instructed, so farre as the doctrine of faith required; but they were not furnished* (saith he) *with acquisite knowledge, or conclusions Arithmeticall, or Geometricall.* Thus farre Aquinas. But that they understood or spake tongues which since have sprung up, is not likely: no more did Adam.

[t] *Instructi fuerunt divinitus in linguis omnium gentium, quantum requirebatur ad fidei doctrinam, &c.*

That

That Adam could have done it by Gods miraculous power, I confesse: that he could out-weather any meer man by his naturall gifts, I beleeve: what he could have done by labour or studie in a little time, if he had heard or read any language, I will not question; since man hath found out the language of Hieroglyphicks; and the tongue of characters hath been read; and if you place constantly severall things in the room of severall letters, a dog for A, a tooth for B, a lion for C, and the like; a little practise will discover the true meaning. But my controversie with Cusanus is, What Adam could do suddenly, naturally, and ordinarily, if he heard our mongrell Neoterick languages. He is for the affirmative; That Adam understood them, or could understand them. I am for the negative.

4. But I must return to Heinsius, with whom I will acknowledge, that the Orientall languages are of infinite worth; most necessarie to be studied, exacting as much labour and pains before they be gained, as they afford delight and profit spirituall when they are obtained; yea, I heartily wish, that even the learned would not presume to interpret the harder places of Scripture, unlesse they be furnished with knowledge in the Eastern tongues: much lesse should the ignorant Laicks expound it. Those beasts ought not to touch this mountain.

That I may omit many memorable passages concerning the Old Testament, I say, that an unusuall splendour from the Syriack, hath fully inlightned many places of the New Testament, which lay in darknesse. View two instances.

5. What was the meaning of *Anathema Maranatha*, 1. Cor. 16. 22. was long unknown, long fought after in vain; as being impossible to be found in the Greek or Latine languages, how copious soever: in the end, it was traced to be an Idiotisme of the Syriack; and a phrase borrowed from the usance and practise of the Jews: for their politie had three sorts of Excommunication. The first called *Niddui*, which regularly was a separation for thirty dayes: during which time, the excommunicated person must keep himself foure cubits aloof from all men and women in all places. The Evangelist seemeth to touch at this, when he recordeth the Constitution of the Jews; that, *if any confessed Christ, ἀποσυνάγωγος γίνεται, extrà Synagogam fieret, He should be put out of the Synagogue*, as the last Translation well expounds it, Joh. 9. 22.

The second, and heavier degree was called *Cherem*, in the Greek ἀνάθεμα: in the Latine, by the Livian phrase, *Devoverius*; by the Cesarean, *Devotus*. It were easie to mention some, who have vowed away themselves, as that resolute young Romane Knight, Marcus Curtius, (see it in Livie *lib. 6.*) and the

soldurii

soldurii (from whence in likelihood cometh the name of *souldiers*) in Cesars commentaries conditionally devoted.

——*Deciique caput fatale voventes;*

And the Decii vowing their own destruction.

Also, at severall times and places, divers others, both captives and natives, have been dedicated to the infernall deities. To which, in the spirituall censure of Christian Excommunication, there is some alluſion, where S. Paul delivered Hymeneus and Alexander unto Satan, 1. Tim. 1. 20. and 1. Cor. 5. 5. where he likewise decreed the like sentence against the incestuous Corinthian.

The third and highest step in this Excommunication, is called *Anathema Maranatha*, ΜΑΡΑΝΑΘΑ for so some reade it in the Greek; also most of the Latine Bibles make it all one word, *Maranatha*; others, *Maranata*, saith Cornelius à Lapide. *What it doth signifie, & the learned Divines long and much endevoured to know: and all much laboured to finde the fountain and origination of that Anathema*, saith Bertram in the Preface on his comparison of the Hebrew and Aramean Grammar. Elias, *in Thisb.* saith, MARA *signifieth* DOMINUS; and so the letter ו, is paragogicall: And *it may be read*, DOMINUS VENIT, *The Lord cometh*, saith Peter Martyr. Likewise for the language, *Some* (saith he) *think it is* [h] *one Syriack word.* [i] *Half Hebrew half Syriack*, as Cornelius à Lapide hath it. [k] *It is more Syriack than Hebrew*, saith Hierom, *Epist. 137. ad Marcel.* [l] *Though* (as he addeth) *it somewhat sounds like Hebrew, by the nearenesse and proximitie of those languages.* In the perfect Hebrew, *Maranatha*, is, *Dominus noster venit*, *Our Lord cometh*. אתה is used Deut. 33. 2. בא *Et venit.* That מר, MARA, or MARAN, is used for *Dominus*, till after the Babylonish captivitie, I reade not. What in the Hebrew is MORE, in the Chaldee is MAR; MAR *Dominus*; MARA or MARIA, *Domina*. *Some Christians of the East at this day call their Prelates* MAR-ABRAHAM, MAR-JOSEPH, saith Cornelius à Lapide. Yea, *the whole sentence is Chaldaick* (if ye beleeve the learned Estius:) *at large*, MARANA-ATHA, *contracted*, MARANATHA. He also hath a wittie relation, That the Jews, before Christs coming, were wont ordinarily to have this word in their mouths, *Maran*, in expectancie of *Christ the Lord*; and on every occasion with reference to him, MARAN, *Our Lord. He will come, he cometh*; MARAN, MARANI. But after Christ was born indeed, and God took on him our nature, and many Jews beleeved; whensoever the unbeleeving brethren still cried their old MARAN, as if the Messiah were not come; the beleevers answered, ATHA, to their MARAN; MARANATHA, *Our Lord is come*: which because the other would not beleeve, they were called *Marani*, and *Maranitæ*, from their iterated *Maran*, and rejecting of *Maran-atha*.

h *Vna dictio Syriaca.*
i *Pars Hebraea-Syriaca.*
k *Magis Syrum est quàm Hebraeum.*
l *Tametsi ex confinio utriusque linguarum aliquid Hebraeum sonat.*



Baronius *in fine Anni* 775. reporteth from Mariana, in his Spanish storie, 7. 6. That a gift was given to a Monasterie; and the violatour of that donation, *jubetur esse Anathema, Marrano, & Excommunicatus.* Where the word is not taken (as some suspect) *à Mauris, from the Moors*; because most of them (in Italie) renounced their Christianitie in the dayes of Frederick Enobarbus; for he reigned 360 yeares, and more, after that gift: but rather, *it is to be borrowed from the Syriack*, MARÁN-ATHA, saith Mariana, commended by Baronius.

The consideration of which curse and excommunication, strikes horrour to my soul, in compassion of those who have raised their houses out of the ruines of things sacred with such dreadfull imprecations, and feed themselves fat with revenews properly belonging to the Altar. If man had not cursed such sacrilegious infringers, God would: but Founders have blasted them with lightning and thunder from heaven. What saith King Stephen in confirmation of his gift to the Priorie of Eye in Suffolk, cited by M. Selden in his Historie of Tithes, *cap.* 11. *pag.* 350? *Whosoever shall willingly and wittingly take away, diminish, or disturb any one of all these things which are contained in this Charter: By the authoritie of God Omnipotent, the Father, Sonne, and holy Ghost, and of all the Apostles and Saints, let him be excommunicated and anathematized, and sequestred from the companie of the Lord, and not be admitted into the Church till he repent.* By which words he intended to terrifie succession, and to keep them from sacriledge. Let the world know that there are many, and, as it falleth out now, too many such direfull execrations annexed by holy Benefactours, to eternize their gifts: And as that good King said of himself, That he was [m] *Willing to partake with them who by an happie commerce exchange earth for heaven*: So I fear, that the sacrilegious Usurpers have indeed exchanged *Heaven* for *Mammon*; and I pray to God that such devout and deliberate maledictions hang not over their posteritie to this day, nor may extend beyond the first Atheisticall cormorants.

The same M. Selden in his book called *Marmora Arundelliana, pag.* 65. mentioneth a Christian inscription which (as he conjectureth) both prayed to the most holy Mother of God for such as were Benefactours to a Monasterie; and cursed them who did it any damage, with the imprecations of divers holy men; wishing, that whosoever did so, might in the day of judgement have against him for an adversarie the same most holy Mother of God. These things I have related out of that most learned Antiquarie, my worthy friend M. Selden, rather then the like out of other Authours; because I would not have either Clergie or Laitie conceit of him (as full many do) that he intended as great a devastation to our tithes con-

[l] *Quicunque aliquid de his quæ in hac charta continentur [illegible] minuere, aut [illegible] scienter voluerit, [illegible] auctoritate Domini Omnipotentis, Patris, & Filii, & Spiritûs Sancti, & sanctorum Apostolorum, & omnium Sanctorum, sit excommunicatus, anathematizatus, & à consortio Domini, & liminibus Sanctæ Ecclesiæ sequestratus, donec resipiscat.*

[m] *Volens partem habere cum iis qui felici commercio cœlestia pro terrenis commutant.*

consecrated by God and to God, by a double *Jus divinum*, as ever the Black-smiths sonne brought upon Religious houses; or that he was the instrument of ungracious Politicians, or his book the trumpet to animate the armies of the destroyers against the pitifull poore remnants of our Church, not enough (forsooth) as yet reformed; that is, not enough beggarly; though some poison in that book hath already wrought so piercingly upon us; that our hair is fallen from our heads, and our nails from our fingers, as needing no more paring; and in the cases of our tithes we are shaved and cut worse then the messengers of peace, 2. Sam. 10. 4. Yet saith M. Selden himself in his Review, pag. 471. *The many execrations annexed to the deeds of conveyance of them, and powred forth against such as should divert them to profane uses, should be also thought on:* Not onely thought on, say I, but trembled at, till the houre of restitution. And let them remember also who saith, That *it is a destruction for a man to devoure what is consecrated*, Prov. 20. 25. which destruction is damnation; not cared for by our devouring Esaus, if they may fill their bellies with [illegible] ed morsels; as appeared in those whirl-winde-dayes [illegible] the eighth, and would have appeared since, if God had [illegible] ruled the heart of religious King James, of most happie memorie, and of our sacred Soveraigne (to whom we of the Clergie do more especially pray God, to send all happinesse, equall to his desires on earth, and a more glorious estate among blessed Saints, then he hath now among men) to keep the commandments of their and our God, above any worldly benefit.

I must return back to *Maran-atha*; whose composition is thus, as Martyr openeth. The first part of it, is the Noun MARA: the second is an affix of the possessive Pronoun, of the first person, with the number of multitude, making MARA to be MARAN: the third particle and the close, is the Verb ATHA, *venit*. Moreover, concerning the tense of the Verb there is question. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact reade it *in tempore praterita*, ὁ κύριος ἦλθε. *Our Lord is come*; with whom agree Hierom and Estius: others will have it to be the present tense, speaking as if he did come presently, because he shall come certainly; and because none can say, he shall not come at this present. This tense Cornelius à Lapide approveth, on this consideration, because the Jews condemning any were wont to do so, under the commination and contestation of the instant divine judgement, as Psal. 9. 19. *Arise, O Lord, — let the heathen be judged in thy sight*: or rather, saith Lapide, it may be in the Optative, MARAN-ATHA, *Veniat Dominus*: howsoever he is peremptorie, that it is a cold exposition which applieth the words to the Preterperfect tense,

and the meaning to the first coming of Christ.

Let me adde, that whether the word be read in the Present tense in the Indicative, or in the Optative mood, *Venit*, or, *veniat*; *He cometh*, or *let him come*; it poineth not at the past, but at the future coming of Christ. Yea, Jude 14. (where the word [illegible] is used) our Translation hath it, *The Lord cometh*, and the words immediately following, make it to have apparent, and undeniable reference to the last judgement. Nor were the words *Maran-atha* taken from Moses, Deut. 33. 2. though he saith, *The Lord [illegible] with 11000 of Saints*: where is a great similitude of [illegible] circulars; for there is related what passed at the delive[illegible] Law, and neither *Mara* nor *Maran* is mentioned, but [illegible] the semblance of words we may think Moses alluded to the propheſie of Enoch, which long after this S. Jude citeth expreſly, as prophefying of future punishment to be inflicted for the breach of the Law. And indeed Ambroſe well expounds our *Maran-atha* of the second coming of Christ: ſo Clemens Romanus, *Epiſt. 2. in fine.* [illegible] 178 thus, *Anathema, condemnatus, Maran-atha, [illegible], Donec Dominus redeat; Condemned till the Lord return to judgement.*

Moſt true it is, *Maran-atha* is added, to exaggerate the power of the Execration, and that it is a form of Execration; ſo was it in the intent of the Donor in Mariana. The Talmudiſts ſay, it ſignifieth one delivered into the hand of the Tormentour, by the judgement of the Lord himſelf. Anſwerable it is in ſenſe, to the words in the 17. Chapter of the 6. Councel of Toledo; [1] *May he be perpetually anathematized*: and Chapter 18. [m] *Being ſtricken through with the divine curſe, without all hope of remedy let him be eſteemed damned by the eternall judgement.* Therefore indeed fooliſh were they, who thought *Anathema Maran-atha*, to be a kinde of oath; as if S. Paul adjured them, by the coming of Chriſt; yet ſo ſome held, ſaith Peter Martyr. More fooliſh was Cornelius a Lapide the Jeſuit, who on the place confeſſing the words to be [n] *Words of imprecation, of commination of the eternall damnation*; yea *words of condemnation*: acknowledging alſo, that *Maran-atha*, is *Anathema*, like to *Haſſchammata*, being uſually contracted to *Schammata*, which was generally known to be an excommunication of an high form; adding alſo, that [o] *Maranus and a man excommunicate for apoſtaſie are Synonymes*: yet for all theſe things, by himſelf avouched, ſaith expreſly, [*] *They are not words of one that excommunicateth.* But indeed they are words of an excommunication, taken from the minatorie propheſie of Enoch, recited by S. Jude, verſe 14. *The Lord cometh*: [p] *From thence therefore every man ſeeth that Anathema is deduced, and that according to the Hebrew guiſe it is called Anathema, from the beginning or firſt words of that curſe: which words*

[1] *Perpetuò Anathemate damnetur.*

[m] *Anathemate divino perculſus, abſque ullo remedii loco habeatur damnatus æterno judicio.*

[n] *Verba execrantis, & denuntiantis æternam damnationem, imò verba condemnantis.*

[o] *Maranus eſt idem, quod [illegible], excommunicatus ob apoſtaſiam.*

[*] *Non ſunt verba excommunicantis.*

[p] *Indè ergò nemo non videt deductam illam Anathematis rationem, & ex primis illius Anathematis verbis, minùs aliàs ad alia aliarum ſententiarum initia uſitatis, Anathema ipſum de more Hebræorum appellatum fuiſſe.*

are

are otherwise lesse used to the beginnings of other sentences, saith the learned Bertram. *Maran-atha* is *The highest and greatest degree of excommunication among the Jews*, saith Drusius in his Henoch, pag. 29. who addeth, concerning the Apocryphall books of Henoch, that the Jews say, they have them yet, to this day. From whence it is likely, both that the Jews took their form of excommunication, and from the first words of the curse, *Maran-atha*, might denominate the intire *Anathema, Maran-atha*: as from the beginnings of writs, or from the principall words, many of our Common-law writs are so called aswell as the decrees of Popes.

[a] Extremum genus excommunicationis apud Hebræos.

Nor let any object the unlikelihood, that this *Anathema* is taken from Enochs prophesie, because S. Jude hath it not, like *Maran-atha*, κύριος ἦλθε, but ἦλθε κύριος. I answer, that neither Hebrew, nor Syriack, nor our English, so well endure the placing of the Verb before the Noun, as the Greek doth, but followeth naturally the naturall sequele of the words: and not onely when Enoch spake it, but when S. Jude first wrote in the Syriack (if in it he wrote) that was *Maran-atha*, what after the Spirit was changed into ἦλθε κύριος, and the meaning is all one whether it be κύριος ἦλθε, or ἦλθε κύριος, the Noun must be construed before the Verb, *The Lord cometh, Maran-atha*. This excommunication S. Paul briefly and in two words reciteth, as an usance of the Jewish Synagogue; and fit to be introduced into the Christian Temples, and exercised in Ecclesiasticall discipline. So much of that.

An other instance is in Act. 3. 21. What is in the Latine and Greek full of Amphibologie, diversely, at divers editions, rendered by Beza and others, is plain, & radiant in the Syriack; Ον δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι, *Quem oportet quidē cælum recipere*, saith the vulgat; *The sentence is altogether doubtfull both in Greek and Latine*, saith Bellarmine, Tom. 1. pag. 409. whether *Jesus suscipiat cælum*, or *cælum Jesum*, as Cajetan openeth the case. Now the Syriack, translated by Tremellius, hath it, *Quem oportet cæli capiant; Quem necesse est cælis ut capiant*, as it is varied by the skilfull Linguist Bertram; *Quem oportet cælum ut capiat*, saith the Arabick; all running to the second exposition, that the heavens must contain Christ.

[b] Alioqui enim, si sermo esset de loco, dictum esset, *Quem oportet cælo recipi*.

Which words being firm against the Ubiquitaries, they interpret *Cælum*, not properly, but figuratively, for the glorie, reigne, and majestie of God. [c] *For otherwise, if he had meant the place of Heaven, it would have been said, Who must be received into Heaven:* So Illyricus, *in lib. de Ascensione Christi*. But Illyricus must not teach the holy Ghost how to speak; not be offended, if the All-wise Divine Spirit use an Amphibolous phrase in the Greek, which is cleared by the more Eastern tongues. In my opinion, he might rather have said, that, perhaps, by *Heaven*

God is meant; both because our blessed Saviours last words were, Luke 23. 46. *Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit*; which most certainly was received into the hands of his Father in heaven; as also, for that not onely the word *Cœli*, in the plurall number, is taken for God; according to the use of the Aramæans and also of the Jews; as appeareth in the record containing the jointure and dowrie which Rabbi Moses made to Clarora, the daughter of Rabbi David, explained by Bertram, at the end of his Aramæan and Hebrew Grammar; where the Bridegroom saith (among other things) [1] *Be thou a wife to me according to the law of Moses and Israel: and I according to Gods commandment will worship, honour, keep & govern thee*: somewhat according, as in our marriages, the husband promiseth to worship, comfort, honour, and keep his wife: save onely that the Jew did promise to govern his wife, which we leave out; which is also consonant to the authentick Hebrew, Daniel 4. 26. *Dominantur Cœli*, or *Cœli dominentur*; *The Heavens do rule*, as it is in our late Translation; that is, *God in the Heavens doth rule*: But alas because (the Jews, in reverence and fear, avoiding the naming of *Jehova*, and calling him, among many other attributes, *Cœlum*) our Saviour representing in this historicall parable the person of a young penitent jew, speaketh as the Jew would, and placeth the word *Heaven* in the singular number for God. Luke 15. 18. *Father, I have sinned against Heaven.* Likewise Matth. 21. 25. *The baptisme of John, whence was it? from Heaven, or of men?* it is not *from Heaven*, or *from Earth*; but *from Heaven, or of men*; not a *place*, but *persons* are to be understood; and in Heaven, rather God then Angels: and if likelihood lead us to expound it of Angels (as it doth not) yet those Angels represented God, and were so called in his stead. And thus we will passe from this point.

[1] *Esto mihi in uxorem, juxta legem Mosis & Israel; & ego, ex verbo Cœlorum, colam, honorabo, alam & regam te.*

6. The second thing, fit to be premised, is this. If Heinsius mean onely, that there are divers words, phrases, and sentences in the Greek Testament, which never were coyned, stamped, or allowed in Athens, as free-denizons of Greece; but are borrowed, and translated from the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriack; no man will oppose him; and the exemplifying of it were easie and delightfull, if I had not made too large excursions before, in a matter not much differing from this: But when he saith, They who were jews by birth or generation, and withall did both know and speak Greek, may be called *Hellenists*; and that these Hellenists, writing in Greek, much differed in language from the Heathen Grecians: As I deny it not in the generall; so some Jews there were, who, being wonderously well versed in the Greek, wrote in Greek most politely: whence Philo Judæus was said to Platonize; and Josephus is styled by Baronius, *The Greek Livie*.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, if Heinsius had onely said, that S. John saw the Hellenists, that S. John might have seen the paraphrase of Onkelos, that the Chaldee Metaphrasts *sanctissimis Judæi pluribus in locis plagiis*, that S. John *ad Chaldaicam sæpe alludit interpretationem, quæ Judæi Asiatici, ut olim, sic nunc utuntur*, all which he saith pag. 61. I would onely have wished to see his proofs.

Fourthly, if Heinsius mean, that the Hellenists onely, who were not inspired from God, conceived in one tongue, what they did write, and wrote in another, what they conceived; I will subscribe, and adde, that whatsoever they did speak in Greek, they first had the notions of it in Syriack, and thence did, as it were, translate their speech, or writings; even (perhaps) Philo, and Josephus, and such as trafficked much with Greece, and Greeks: unless among the Jews there might be such a case, as was of Lord Michael de Mountaigne, who (as himself relateth in his Essaies, l. 2. c. 12.) being borne a French man, yet never heard French, till he was above six yeares old, nor understood any word of his mother-tongue, no more then he did Arabick; because he was brought up, where he heard no other language spoken, then Latine onely: and therefore long after, when he usually spake nothing, but his Perigordin or French, yet upon great sudden exigents, his conceits were first shaped in Latine, and his words brake forth, ere he was aware, in Latine, and not in French, as himself recordeth. So say I, if a Jew were thus brought up in the Greek, or in any other languages, his conceits might be the apprehensions of his childish language, and not of that tongue which he used after.

Fifthly, and lastly, if because Heinsius himself is a daintie Critick, he will reduce the judgement of all Divinitie to Scriptures, of all Scriptures to Criticisme; I will not contradict it, if we confine this judiciarie Censorship and Criticisme to men skilfull and eminent in all arts, sciences, and languages: for who can so well interpret Scripture, as such men? It was a passionate conceit of hood-winkt men, as is recorded in the historie of the councel of Trent, lib. 2. pag. 122. [a] *When each man hath power to inquire into the translation of the Scripture whether it be good or no; either comparing it with other interpreters, or consulting with the Hebrew Text: then these new-sprung petty-Grammarians would make a confusion of all things, and arrogate to themselves alone the judgement and resolutions in matters of faith.* And pag. 125. Almost all allowed the vulgar Edition, [b] *This made a powerfull impression upon the mindes of the Prelates: because it was said Grammarians would assume to themselves authoritie to direct and instruct Bishops and Divines.* Wisely, wisely, as if Divines and Bishops ought not to have been perfect Grammarians before they were Divines: As if both could not consist together: As if famous and deep Divines had not been admirable, yea, the

[a] *Persuasa animis fuisse in Scripturæ versionem inquirendi, utrum proba sit, & cum aliis interpretibus cum comparanda, vel contextu Hebræo consulto: tum novos hosce Grammaticastros omnia interturbaturos, & sibi soli judicium & arbitrium in rebus fidei arrogaturos.*

[b] *In præsulum animos vehementi inde impressione facta, quòd dicebatur, Grammaticos Episcoporum ac Theologorum institutendorum potestatem sibi arrogaturos.*

the beſt and ſoundeſt of all Linguiſts and Criticks; whom they ſcornfully term pettie Grammarians: As if they envied any thing theſe paſſages of learning, which they kenned not; and would put out the candle, which other men lighted, delighting rather in darkneſſe, then ſuffering ſome places, uſed by Popes and School-men, to be queſtioned and cleared: and it was a juſt indignation of the Friars againſt the Fathers, in the councel of Trent, becauſe they were ſo prompt to define Articles, and pronounce Anathemaes, when they did not well underſtand, and were loth to be taught the things themſelves, as it is in the Hiſtorie of the councel of Trent, lib. 6. pag. 481.

But ſince he ſaith of the Evangeliſt S. John, *He alwaits had an eye to the Targumiſts*, pag. 189. and, *He ſtill reſpecteth the Targumiſts*, pag. 250. and, *All the words and ſpeech ſounds ſtrange*, pag. 230. as if there were not in S. Job one line, or phraſe, of pure good heathen Greek. Since he maketh the Helleniſticall Greek & the other Greek, divers languages, pag. 373. though they differ not ſo much as ſome Dialects, (beſides his jerk at Nonnus for his Grecanick, rather then Greek) adding to this effect, Prolegom. pag. 93. *Many have known ſuperficially the Helleniſticall tongue, but few the depth of it.* Since he reſteth not at this, ſaying, *It much matereth to know, whether an Helleniſt expreſſe the Hebrew, or the Syriack in Greek; and whether he hath an eye to the Hebrew Text, or to the interpretations of the Grecians*; but addeth, [a] *All which unleſſe the Interpreter diſtinguiſh, he muſt needs loſe his labour.* And *he hath little knowledge, and no conſcience* (as Heinſius cenſureth) [b] *who dares tranſlate the Scripture, and thought not on theſe things*, Pag. 53. *Prolegom.* Whereby all the Primitive-Church, the Schoolmen, and late Writers, Interpreters or Tranſlatours, who knew not Hebrew from Syriack, are cenſured as unconſcionable ignorants. Since he proceedeth, avouching, *The knowledge of the New Teſtament* [c] *in vain ſhall you ſeek from the Grecians, becauſe both words and phraſes winde up to the Hebrew or Syriack.* And again, *The Greek Fathers* [d] *amazing the world with their abundant learning, have given document, that other things without the Hebrew are little worth:* Whence may be inferred, that the knowledge of the Greek in the New Teſtament is not to be found in the Greek Fathers, and that their labours have been of little worth: though ſome Greek Fathers knew the Eaſtern tongues better then Heinſius; as Origen, Theodoret, and others; and the moſt learned of them all in thoſe Eaſtern languages, to wit, Origen, was the worſt of them all in the interpretation of Scriptures. Since he proclaimeth in his *Prolegomena*, *Cùm plurima in novo fœdere à ſummis maximiſque hominibus ſunt præſtita, potiſſima pars ſupereſſe videtur*: Which is as much as if he had ſaid, All the world have not expounded the Greek Teſtament half well enough: or, not half of it well enough to this day:

or,

x *Perpetuò ad Targumiſtas reſpexit.*
y *Ad Targumiſtas ſemper reſpicit.*
z *Totum λελιχὸν, quod voces & ſermonem ſpectat, peregrinum eſt.*

a *Quæ niſi omnia diſtinguat, operam neceſſe eſt interpres ludat.*
b *Qui transferre ſacra audet, & de his non cogitavit.*

c *Fruſtrà petas ex Græcis, quis ad Hebraam aut Syriacam & dictio & voces exigenda ſunt.*
d *Omni eruditione ad ſtuporem omnium inſtructi.*

or, the choicest, learnedest men have laboured much; but the best or chiefest things have they not cleared: as if they who well interpreted Hebrew with her Dialects in the Old Testament, had been faultie in their interpretations of the New Testament, because they understood not, or reflected not up to the same Hebrew and her Dialects.

I say, in all these regards we must sever from Heinsius; and leaving him to his singularitie, hold our selves to the generall expositions which Fathers, Councels, and the Church of God hath made of Scripture; till this more then *Doctor subtilis*, or *Doctor Seraphicus* (for they are by him rejected, as being wholly ignorant of the Hebrew, Syriack, or Hellenistick Greek) give us better and more light. All which things I passe by with a touch onely, because he hath one strain of farre more both difficultie and moment. In which one point many are involved, and some of those seldome or never handled.

His words are these in his *Prolegomena*, pag. 52. [a] *If one ask of me, In what language S. John wrote, I will say, He wrote as an Hellenist: If one enquire in what language he conceived the things which he wrote, I will say, He conceived them in the Syriack tongue, and thus he first bend the Greek, and winde up in the Syriack both the words and the sayings, as is proper to the Hellenists. Wherefore we must not have recourse to the allusions which now are, but we must look to them which S. John then conceived in his minde.* Yea, *Prolegg.* pag. 49. he saith in generall, [b] *The Penmen of the New Testament conceived in one language what they wrote, and wrote in another what they conceived.* So he.

Such is the power and vertue of naked truth, that if we could see her as she is in her self, *Admirabiles sui amores excitaret, She would make men wonderfully enamoured on her:* and such is the ougliness of errour and untruth, that they dare not appeare without masks, vizors, colours, faculles; but go commonly trooping in the company of truth or likelihoods. And so it fareth in these words of Heinsius, in which there are some truths mingled and shuffled together with some errours; which will easier be distinguished by their severall ranks and files, if we consider and handle three *Lemmata*, or *Postulata*, *Rationabiles axiomes* or *demands*, which I account as granted: seven Questions and five Conclusions directly opposing Heinsius.

1. The first *Postulatum* is this, That the inspirations and conceptions of the sacred Penmen, were divinely delivered under one or other language.

S. Basil in Psal. 28. said remarkably, that *the intellectuall and inward conceits of the inspired were after a wonderfull manner, as it were, figured and characterized.* S. Augustine, *de Gen. ad literam*, 12. 26. saith thus of the kinds of prophesying by spirituall vision: [c] *If the soul be raised from and above the*

[a] Si quis ex me quærat; Quamnam linguam scripserit Evangelista noster S. Joannes Hellenistice scripsisse dicam: Si autem quis conceperit, qua scripsit; Syriacam linguam dicam: Ad eum modum, quod ei Hellenistæ proprium; & verba & sententias deflexisse Græcas. Quære ab aliquibus; non quæ cuique, sed quæ illum concepisse; cognoscas.

[b] Novi sanctos Scriptores linguâ concepisse alia, quæ scriberent; alia scripserunt, quæ conceperant.

[c] Si ab ipsa similitudinibus rapiatur, ut in

the phantasmes, so that it is elevated and carried, as it were, into that region of things intellectuall and intelligible; where without any phantasme or similitude apparent truth is seen, no clouds of opinion dimming it; there the faculties and powers of the soul are not turmoiled or painfully fused; there the brightnesse or excellencie of the Lord is seen, not by any typicall or corporall vision, as it was seen in mount Sina, or spirituall, as Isaiah saw, and S. John in the Revelation: but plainly and directly, not darkly, or in riddles, so farre as the minde of man can conceive, according to the grace of the indulgent Lord, so lifting up the soul, that he speaks face to face to him whom the Lord makes worthy of such a conference. Understand the face or mouth, not of the body, but of the minde.

Dionysius, *cœlestis Hierarch. cap.* 1. somewhat otherwise: [h] *It is impossible that the divine light should otherwise shine upon us, then clouded and surrounded with varietie of sacred vailes and coverings.* For humane understanding cannot conceive the very bare and naked intelligible truth her self, without conversion to the *Phantasmata*; therefore things propounded to men by God or Angels, are propounded under sensible similitudes, and resemblances not meerly incorporeall: I say, *by God or Angels*; for howsoever Dionysius *cap.* 9. *de divinis nominibus, part.* 1. [i] *aliquantulum ante medium*, saith: *All divine irradiations are brought unto men by the interposition or help of Angels*: and Gregorie, *Dialog.* 4, 5. [k] *In this visible world nothing can be ordered but by the invisible creature*: yet I would be loath peremptorily to exclude Gods immediate operation or illumination, but rather conclude, That all intellectuall irradiation of men, either by God immediately, or by Angels, is by known *species*.

Basil on Psal. 7. *I think that the Prophets received not the word of God by sensible hearing, by the corresponding help and conformation of the aire; but since the intellective soul hath its proper kinde of eares or hearing, what was spoken from above and from God, came to their knowledge and notice, without any bodily voice.* See Aquin. *part.* 1. *quæst.* 110. *artic.* 1.

In all three kindes of oracles, by which God speaketh to men (the Externall, the Imaginarie, spirituall, the Spirituall-intellectuall) there are some *species* or other intercurrent between God inspiring and inlightning, and man apprehending or conceiving. Though where Fulgentius saith truly, that in divine inspiration, [m] *Without the sound of words or elements of letters, the truth speaketh so much the sweeter, by how much the secreter*, is rightly inferred, that there is no outward sound; yet there is an intellectuall *loquitur* of the Spirit to our inward man; and it attempereth and mouldeth it self to the capacitie, abilitie, and habituall *species* of the part recipient, that is, our understanding; or frameth our understanding to it.

Men

illam quasi regionem intellectualium & intelligibilium subvehatur, ubi sine ulla similitudine perspicua veritas cernitur, nullis opinionum falsarum nebulis obfuscatur; ibi virtutes animæ non sunt operosæ: ibi videtur claritas Domini, non per visionem significantem, sive corporalem, ut visa est in monte Sina, sive spiritualem, ut vidit Isaias, & Joannes in Apocalypsi; sed per speciem, non per ænigmata; quantum ea capere mens humana potest, secundum assumentis Dei gratiam, ut os ad os loquatur ei, quem dignum tali Deus colloquio fecerit; non os corporis, sed os mentis.

[h] *Impossibile est aliter nobis lucere divinum radium, nisi varietate sacrorum velaminum circumvelatum.*

[i] *Omnes divinæ illuminationes perferuntur ad homines mediantibus Angelis.*

[k] *In hoc mundo visibili nihil, nisi per creaturam invisibilem, disponi potest.*

[l] *Arbitror Prophetas nequaquam percepisse Verbum Dei sensili auditu, per conformationem aëris: sed quando animæ intellectu prædita, sine suppetunt aures, quæ à superno nuntiabantur, citra ullam corporis vocem, ad eorum pertingebant notitiam.*

[m] *Sine sonis sermonum & elementis literarum, eò dulcius, quo secretius, veritas loquitur.*

Men may be taught new languages on a ſudden, and underſtand as ſuddenly things before unknown; but to conceive without ſome kinde of word, is above conceit. God himſelf cannot be conceived by men, but by ſimilitudes of things corporeall; and, perhaps, even Angels cannot conceive of him but under ſome ſhadow: for a finite thing cannot comprehend an infinite eſſence, but onely according to its model. An infinite thing onely can comprehend infinitie as it is in itſelf.

When the Spirit of God immediately ſpeaketh to the ſpirits of men, though the irradiation be ſpirituall and intellectuall, yet it is ſhaped to the habits of knowledge acquired. Infuſed notions muſt be proportionable to acquired, actuall to habituall; all homogeneall, not heterogeneall; having affinitie, and holding correſpondent intelligence with the *ſpecies* received. [a] *Whatſoever is received, is received according to the meaſure, power, or facultie of the receiver*, is a true ground, and ſound maxime, as well in Divinitie as in Philoſophie.

There is not an higher illumination then was that of S. Paul: yet was there in him, and in all others, ſomewhat *loco ſigni & vocis, in the room or ſtead of the ſigne, voice, or ſpecies.* 2. Cor. 12.4. *I heard unſpeakable words*, (yet words ſpoken) *which it was not lawfull* (or poſſible) *for a man to utter:* yet to him they were uttered; and it is not certain that he was bodily rapt into the third heaven.

Auguſtine, *de Geneſ. ad liter.* 12.27. diſcourſing of Gods ſpeaking to Moſes, Numb. 12.8. *Os ad os loquar ad illum, in ſpecie, & non per ænigmata; I will ſpeak to him face to face, apparently and plainly, not by riddles or obſcurities*, ſaith, *This is not to be underſtood according to the bodily ſubſtance preſented to the eyes of the fleſh; for ſo he ſpake to Moſes face to face, when Moſes ſaid, Oſtende mihi temetipſum, Shew me thy ſelf*: and addeth, [b] *But in that way, and in that form as he is God, he ſpeaketh ineffably, more ſecretly, more home and cloſe to the purpoſe, more nearely preſent with words unſpeakable.* And in the Chapter following he ſaith, *The ſpeaking mouth to mouth was* [c] *by ſuch a ſpecies, by which God is whatſoever is: howſoever the minde of man which is not as God, cannot conceive him without bodie or bodily ſimilitude:* where ſtill he maketh a kinde of not-ſpeaking ſpeech, or of ſpeaking non-ſpeech, according to the capacitie of man.

The ſecond *Lemma* is this, That the holy Actuaries, or Writers of the Divine Scripture, could not erre in their conceptions.

Auguſtine, *de Geneſ. ad liter.* 12.25. proveth daintily in generall, that our outward and inward ſenſes may be deceived, when onely the intellectuall viſion is certain, and is not deceived: [d] *Either it underſtandeth, and then it is true; or if it be not true,*

[a] *Quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis.*

[b] *Illo ergò modo, in illa ſpecie qua Deus eſt, longè ineffabiliter ſecretius & præſentius loquitur locutione ineffabili.*

[c] *Per ſpeciem ſcilicet, quâ eſt Deus quicquid eſt: quantulumcunque enim mens, qua non eſt quod ipſe, &c.*

[d] *Aut enim intelligit, & verum eſt; aut, ſi non eſt verum, non intelligit.*

true, it understandeth not. As the aire is enlightened by the resplendent rayes of the sunne, so was their intellect by supernall, bright, unfailing irradiation; which beam of divine light wrought these two effects: First, that they knew certainly it was God who spake unto them: Secondly, that they could not misconceive or take awry in an erring sense the things inspired: which illumination may be called *Gustus Dei*, *The taste of God*, Psal. 34. 8. *The wheels with strakes full of eyes rounde about them*, Ezek. 1. 18. *Cloven tongues like as of fire*, Act. 2. 3. *As it were*, * *a sixth sense leading to knowledge*, as Clemens *Recognit. lib.* 2. termeth it: *A joyfull sound, the light of Gods countenance*, Psal. 89. 15. *In thy light we shall see light*, Psal. 36. 9. *A burning and a shining light*, Joh. 5. 35. *A marvellous light*, 1. Pet. 2. 9. *Sol spiritualis*, *An intellectuall sunne*: *Sapor*, *a savour or taste*; *which Monica could not expresse by words*, as her sonne relateth, *Confess.* 6. 13. *Intimus sapor*, saith Gregorie, *Dialog.* 4. 4. *Intimus sapor & experimentalis illuminatio*, *A most inward relish, and experimentall illumination*, as Gerson styleth it: *Columna ignis*, *A pillar of fire*, Exod. 13. 21. *Stella Magos in Oriente antecedens*, *The starre conducting the wise men of the East*, Matth. 2. 9. *An holy, undeceiving, unambiguous influent coruscation: The Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters*, Gen. 1. 2. This made Abraham not unwillingly to sacrifice his sonne. The quenching of this Spirit against the cleare light of his own convicted conscience, made the old Prophet more inexcusable then the other officious lying Prophet, who deceived him, 1. Kings 13. 18, &c. Nor did an Angel speak unto the seducer by the word of the Lord, vers. 18. Samuel being but a childe might not indeed, as a novice, or some others, for a while, might not know the voice of the Lord: as Peter at the present knew not the operation of God by the Angel, in his miraculous deliverie: *But now I know* (saith he) *that God hath sent his Angel*, yea, *I know of a surety*, Act. 12. 11.

* *Sextus sensus præsoscendi.*

Profane ones I will not priviledge from mistaking of God: as perhaps, lest Satan might out-stretch his Commission from God, when he gave Job into his hands, God said restrainingly, *Only save his life*, Job 2. 6. And S. Augustine, *de cura pro mortuis gerenda*, *cap.* 12. telleth an admirable storie of two men, each called *Curma*; to wit, How Curma the Countrey-man lay almost dead many dayes: onely, a little steam of breath coming from him, they kept him from burial, though he was without motion, or any feeling, whatsoever they did unto him, in which time he saw many visions: So soon as he opened his eyes, he said, *Let one go to the house of Curma the smith*. Who was found dead that moment in which Curma the Husbandman came to his senses. And the surviving Curma related, that he heard in the place from whence he was returned, that the

the ſmith, and not himſelf, was to be brought to that place. A miſtaking there was by the meſſengers of death, though it were after righted. Caiaphas might not know the inſpiration or inſtinct propheticall which he had; becauſe he was a wicked man: *Diſpenſative illi contigit ſermo, He did diſtribute the ſpeech to others, which he knew not himſelf*, ſaith Baſil *in Prooem. Iſaiæ*. He was a Prophet *perchance, Caſu*, ſaith Origen on John. Balaam his aſſe and Caiaphas ſpake they knew not what. *The prophetie not tranſitorie*, ſaith S. Auguſtine. Wherefore I conclude, as before, That wicked men may be puniſhed with miſtakings in things divine. But that ever any holy man was ignorant to the end, that God moved when he moved him; or that the righteous were ever deceived by Oraculous, anfractuous perplexities; or that the Notaries of heaven, the writers of any part authentick of either Teſtament, could be deceived in their conceptions, is not agreeable to likelihood, reaſon, or truth.

The laſt *Lemma* is this, The holy Pennen could not erre in writing.

If they could, what difference is there between their Writings, and other profane Authours?

And to what end had they infallibilitie of underſtanding, if what they underſtood they could expreſſe erroneouſly?

A readie, perfect, and quick ſcribe writeth not falſly; but, *My tongue is the pen of a readie writer*, ſaith the Pſalmograph, Pſal. 45.1. Holy Ezra, who was the divine *amanuenſis* of the book of Ezra, is called by the ſame words, SOPHER MAHIR, *a readie, ſwift, exact ſcribe*, Ezra 7.6. no queſtion, with alluſion to the words of the Pſalmiſt.

John 16.13. *When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth*. How into all truth, if there be an errour in writing? Or, had God care that the Apoſtles ſhould not miſſe of the truth in their Speeches, and yet miſſe in their Writings?

If the Prophets could not erre, no more could the Evangeliſts or Apoſtles: for, if there were any ſuperioritie in priviledge, we are rather to aſcribe it to theſe latter, then to thoſe former, in regard that the Law of Chriſt and of Grace, is farre above the Law of Moſes, as the Apoſtle doth demonſtrate to the Hebrews themſelves. But that the Prophets could not erre is apparent, becauſe Chriſt himſelf, who is Truth, would not have appealed from the preſent more viſible pretending Synagogue, to them as all-ſufficient Judges (as he often did) if they could erre. A perfect rule is not to be tried by an imperfect one. Prophets writ their Propheſies, and faſtened them to the gates of the Temple, and other publick places, to be read: and were rather judged by their Propheſies written, then by them as inſpired or uttered by mouth.

The *Gnomon* of the Sunne-diall, which our late Hieroglyphical Poetaster doth make to signifie the Scriptures, is better to be judged by a moving clock, the curious handie-work of the same great Artist (I mean, by the Church, and Churchmen, with whom Christ hath promised his Spirit shall be to the end of the world) then by the rude masons, or rather the senselesse stones and morter of the walls, (I mean the ignorant people) who have plucked down not onely the Weather-cock (by his interpretation, the Pope) but usurp to themselves a power to judge the *Gnomon*, and to reform and amend the well wrought, well ordered clock. The shallow phantastick stateth not the question aright, when he is so magisterially peremptorie, saying, *Thus the Clergie may not so judge of the Scriptures, as to conclude or teach any thing against them; or to vouch unwritten veraties* (if they be certain veraties, it matter-eth not much whether they be written or unwritten: Veritie will vouch it self in spight of lying Poets) *as some call them, or Traditions contradictorie to the written Word*: Which contradictorie Traditions do much differ from unwritten Veraties, howsoever the Poet confusedly joyneth them. For, who of us ever taught that the Clergie may teach any thing against the Scriptures? when we professe with him, that the Church ought to subject it self to be directed by the Scriptures. But that fabling rymer may say any thing, who in his *Sureasmos* and Frontispice is suffered thus to rave,

No wonder this the Clergie would be Kings:

whereas we the now unpriviledged Clergie, do humbly pray to God to uphold our declining estates from the hands of those Atheists, and turbulent Anti-episcopall, Anti-monarchicall Reformists; perhaps Pensioners of the forein enemies of our State, who, under the pretence of Religion, labour to pluck down our Church and Ecclesiastick Hierarchie; and upon the ruines thereof to arise to the depluming of the Eagle; to the bearding of the Lion; not onely to the paring of the royall prerogative, but also the removing the very scepter and crown from the Anointed of the Lord, (whom God alwaies mightily defend!) and to the bringing in of popular government: for, *No Bishop, no King*, said the learned, wise, and pious King James, most truely.

I return to retort the Church-reforming Poets words upon himself: In his Solatie he saith, That the diall is the Written Word, which is of it self dead and unprofitable, without further illumination; since none of the Philosophers, nor Solomon himself, by the meer strength of Nature, could from thence draw saving knowledge without saving grace. The question is not, Whether the Scripture or Church shall be Judge; but, Whether the Clergie or Laitie shall be Interpre-

ters

ters of this dead word, and unprofitable without further illumination. We bid not the people to pluck out their eies, that they may be led by us, as the Jesuites and Popish Priests do; neither do we like the other extream of the people, presuming that they can give better answer then the Ephod, the Urim and the Thummim; and over-see the Seers, who ought (by the expresse commandment of God himself) to have the oversight of them, Heb. 13.17. But they are to rest contented with the generall Commission given in the Ministerie, *He that heareth you, heareth me*, especially in things (as most things are) above their capacitie. But the people will expound Scriptures, contradict their Pastours, censure their labours, judge their Judges, even in matters of such speculation as they may most safely be ignorant of; and, under pretence of desire to have their consciences well informed, will not be informed at all in any thing against their humours and fancie, but monopolize the Spirit to themselves, and yeeld no more in this point to the ordinance of God, who hath committed to us the word of reconciliation, then to the very devils, whom they are bound to beleeve and follow, in all things wherein their consciences are well informed.

My former task recalleth me: Bezaleel and Aholiab both did and could work all manner of work for the service of the Sanctuarie, *according to all that the Lord had commanded*, Exod. 36.1. Had God more care of his Sanctuarie, then of the Church of Christ? Or could God command an untruth, when he guided the Apostles and Evangelists as powerfully, if not more then ever he did the workmen of his Sanctuarie. Or had the Penmen lesse grace or goodnesse then the workmen? Certainly they had, if they swarved in writing from what was commanded by God. Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make the Tabernacle; *See* (saith God) *that thou makest all things according to the pattern shewed thee in the mount*, Hebr. 8.5. which the Apostle borrowed from Exod. 25.8, &c. where God giveth this charge, *Let them make me a Sanctuarie — according to all that I shew thee, after the pattern of the Tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it.* So, and no otherwise, not so much as a little nail or peg shall make any difference. And shall we think, that the Evangelists and Apostles might swarve in writing from what was delivered unto them?

That Christ himself could and did reade, is proved Luk. 4. 16. That he could and did write is plain, John 8.6, &c. That he ever wrote any part of his doctrine, of the Law of Grace, of our Scripture, is not evident: for though Baronius, *ad annum Christi* 31. saith, That many of the Ancients beleeved that our blessed Saviour wrote an epistle unto Abagarus, or Abgarus,

Prince of Edessa, yet since Salianus wholly balketh this storie, (which he would not have done, if there had been either truth or likelihood in the matter, because of the miracles mentioned by Baronius, wrought by the image of our Saviours face, which himself sent to the same Prince) let us esteem it as a thing unworthy of belief. That whatsoever Christ did, he did both well and conveniently, and whatsoever he omitted, he also omitted well and conveniently, I take for most certain: and yet, if he had done something which he omitted, I dare say he had also done well and conveniently: and I should be afraid to say, That it was not convenient for Christ to write any part of Scripture therefore, because personally he wrote none. *It was convenient for others, and not for Christ himself, to write his own doctrine* (saith Aquin. 3. part. quæst. 42. art. 4.) *for the excellencie both of the Teacher, and of the doctrine*, which he confirmeth thus, *The most excellent way was, to imprint his doctrine in their hearts: So did Christ teach, As having Power, Matth. 7. 29. and Pythagoras and Socrates, the excellentest teachers among the Gentiles, would write nothing. For the Scripture is ordained to imprint doctrine in the hearts, as to an end. Moreover, if Christ had written his own doctrine, men would never have had an higher esteem of his doctrine, then of that which might arise from things contained in Scripture.* Those are the words of Aquin. Much of this is but meer froth, and the shadow of reason, unfitting the person of so Angelicall a Doctour, who remembred not that God himself wrote the Law; and that God did write the Law in some mens hearts, as well as in stone, Hebr. 8. 10. and so might Christ in both, if he had pleased. As for Pythagoras and Socrates, if they wrote nothing, yet their words made no deeper impression upon the hearts of their auditours, then the writings of many other men have done upon the hearts of their readers. Moreover, some have thought that Pythagoras and Socrates were not the excellentest teachers among the Gentiles; Aristotle and Plato are esteemed their equals; and some have preferred Hermes Trismegistus and Homer before both of them. Indeed the Scripture was ordained to imprint doctrine in the heart, was it therefore inconvenient that Christ himself should write? His speech was ordained to imprint his doctrine in their hearts, as to an end, yet was not his speech inconvenient: no more inconvenient had been his writing, yea rather more convenient (if so it had pleased him) because many of his words reached but to a few, but his writings might have reached to many millions of places and persons more, and might have been everlasting. To conclude, If the Jews looked through the vails, types, and shadows of Moses Law, to the more spirituall things of Christ; then certainly, if Christ had writ

¶ *Nihil altiùs de ejus doctrina homines æstimarent, quàm quod Scriptura contineret.*

vain his doctrine, we would not esteem of him according as the learnedly of this doctrine; but we would think (as we ought) that either he wrote not all, or wrote onely such things as were fit for us to know, or as we could understand, reserving more secret, deep, and divine things to himself. For reasons best known to himself, he baptized not any, no not his own Apostles. For reasons best known to himself, he wrote not immediately any part of Scripture. To say it was not convenient because Christ did it not, inferreth that Christ was bound to do all things convenient, yea, and which man judgeth convenient; and what he did not do was not convenient.

God might have beheld, and may yet behold some of his own works, though they be very good: Shall we conclude, that because he did not, therefore it was not fit he should have done so? God did not say at the end of the second day, *It was good*, or *God saw that it was good*, as he did at all and every of the other five days creation: Was it therefore not good? Yes verily, for Gen. 1. 31. *God saw every thing that he had made, and behold, it was very good.*

John 14. 16. *That he may abide with you for ever: even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.* And verse 26. *The Comforter shall teach you all things.* Therefore he shall teach them to write truly: the Spirit of truth will not suffer them to write falsly whilest he dwelleth with them, and in them, as he did when they wrote.

Inspiration was ordained as a cause, and as a means of right conceiving or understanding, or apprehension was appointed as a cause, and a means of right expression or expression was either by word or writing. Many words were prophetically and most divinely spoken, which were not written; not so many were written, as were first spoken. The vocall expression was more transient and transitorie, perhaps, concerning some few, and those onely of those times: the expression permanent, and by writing, was and is directed to mankinde to the end of the world. Inspiration, apprehension, and such expression involved, were all as meanes to this main end, that there might be Scripture. Shall the means be certain, unerring, and infallible, and shall the end be doubtfull, crooked and erring? The perfect use of the right means leads on infallibly to an undeceiving and exact end: if the Divine Penmen could not erre, he must needs in the matter, which sometimes vanisheth, leaving no foot-steps behinde them, it is not possible that they should erre in writings, which is the masterpiece

piece of that divine work, lasting for ever, the absolute square and iudge and canon of all mens thoughts, words, and deeds; unlesse you say, God had lesse care to preserve from corruption divine records, filed up to everlastingnesse and necessarie at all times, for all persons, in all places (as the Scriptures now are) then he had of inspirations, which ended onely in the apprehension, if they were not expressed, or turned into aire, and vanished almost with the breath, if they were onely spoken. Or let any man say, that writing is further removed from the divine operation, then inspiration was, and so more subject to errour: for it shall appeare ere long, that the same Spirit which began by inspiration, and still moving in the waters, not leaving his own work till there was a perfect production, till the end was accomplished, and the will of God written in words and letters of truth; so that not one Iota or tittle had any errour. Yea, let me go one step further, and say, that when the Apostles did dictate to their scribes, actuaries, or secretaries, not onely not themselves, but not their notaries could erre.

And yet I have read of two mad stories crosse to my opinion: the one in Sixtus Senensis, *Bibliotheca sancta*, 2. pag. 140. on the name *Tertius*, who recordeth out of Diodorus Bishop of Tarsus, that this Tertius, being no excellent speaker nor writer, made the obscure Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes to be more obscure, whilest he laboured to expresse S. Pauls thoughts and sense, by more confused and unabsolute sentences, and transposed explications. As if S. Paul could not write sufficiently himself: though he said (in humblenesse) *Rudis sermone sum, but not in speech*, 2. Cor. 11. 6. yet was he *powerfull in writing*, 2. Cor. 10. 10. As if he had not divers most sufficient scribes by him: As if he would permit the writing of so divine, super-divine an Epistle to an Ignorant, a silly fellow: As if Tertius himself wrote not this Epistle *in the Lord*, that is, *by divine authority*, or (as Cajetan thinketh) these words, *In the Lord*, are added to shew that he did not write it as an hireling: which sense is made good by some authorities, according to the diversitie of punctation. As if the Spirit who inspired Paul dictating, ruled not the hand of Tertius writing. As if S. Paul would make for block-headed a disciple as Tertius is feigned to be, to be his scribe, and that in his most majesticall and obscurest Epistle. Or if Tertius were so, that he should be thought worthy to be *Iconii Episcopus*, and have that extraordinarie grace to be crowned with Martyrdome, as Ecclesiasticall historie recordeth of him. As if S. Peter (whom Paul *withstood* for a smaller matter, *to be sure*, Gal. 2. 11.) when he said that there were in all S. Pauls Epistles

some things hard to be understood, would have commended his fellow-Apostles writtings, as he did, 2 Pet. 3. 15. and not rather have found fault with his stile, and the manner of his writing; if not with the matter also, if Tertius had been so absurd as Diodorus imagined; especially seeing S. Peter saith, that the unlearned and unstable wrest some of those writings unto their own destruction: which in all likelihood should justly rather swallow up S. Paul for his carelessnesse of indicting, and Tertius for his supinenesse, or rather blasphemous forgerie of divine truths by mis-writing them; if any fault could have been truely imputed to either of them. But of this we shall speak (by Gods help) more at large in the next section, says one.

The second mad storie followeth. Because some were wont to forge Epistles in S. Pauls name, (as is apparent 2. Thess. 2. 2. where he beseecheth them, *Not to be shaken in minde, or to be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us*) therefore he alway subscribed his own name to all his Epistles, *Wheresoever he knew that there were false teachers*, saith Hierom on Gal. 6. 11. On which place he also relateth, that a very learned man of those times said, S. Paul being an Hebrew knew not Greek letters: and because necessitie required that he should subscribe with his own hand to the Epistle, *He wrote, though in ill-shaped, unhandsome, very great letters*: shewing this testimonie of a kinde affection, that he would endeavour to do for the Galatians what indeed he could not do. Whereby he concluderh, that S. Paul could not write Greek, at least, not in a legible good hand. S. Hierom wondered at the ridiculousnesse of his exposition (as well he might) because the Apostle used to subscribe to divers of his Epistles, and here he wrote this whole Epistle with his own hand: and yet S. Hieroms exposition is almost as forced as the former. *S. Paul* (saith he) *wrote in large king characters or letters, because the sense was great in the words, and was written by the Spirit of the living God, and not with penne and ink.* For though the sense and words of this Epistle to the Galatians be from God, and most divine; yet there is no reason to imagine, that S. Paul intended to include that sense under these words, *Videte*, or *Videtis qualibus literis scripsi vobis manu mea*; *You see how large a letter I have written to you with mine own hand.* But if the word *mine*, doth signifie quantitie, though S. Paul wrote in great letters and characters, yet it might be a verie good and fair hand: as there are few fairer writings then some where the letters are large and full drawn: and I doubt not but he who gave them the extraordinary gift of tongues and languages did also, as a necessarie appendant, give them the power to write well those lan-

[a] *Ubicunque sciebat falsos adesse doctores.*

[b] *Contra consuetudinem curvos tramites literarum vix magnis apicibus exprimebat.*

[c] *Grandibus Paulus literis scripsit, quia sensus erat grandis in literis, & Spiritu Dei vivi, non atramento & calamo fuerat exaratus.*

guages, especially since their writings were to benefit more then their voices could reach unto? We never reade that the holy Apostles, Peter, James, or John, were learned, or could reade or write before their callings, or learned it by degrees after their Apostleship: yet they could and did write; and as the Spirit guided their thoughts and words, so did he their hands, and they wrote both divinely for matter, and (as I think) exquisitely for the manner, yea, more exquisitely then other men; as being governed and actuated by the hand of God, which is perfect in all his works. And indeed the true sense of the place (in my opinion) reacheth not at the deformednesse of the characters, or at the grand-greatnesse of them; but at the length or prolixitie of the Epistle: which is excellently rendered by our English, *You see how large a letter I have written*, 2 Epist. 6. Paul had spoke thus, more at large; *I who before told you that we must not be weary of well-doing, but must do good unto all men whilest we have time, especially to the houshold of faith: I say, I my self have not been remisse in writing this Epistle, though it be long: and whilst I had time, I have spent that time in doing you good, by writing this letter, by writing this long and large letter to you. For though I have written longer Epistles; yet I did rather subscribe to them, and wrote not all of any one of them with mine own hand; but you may take it as a token of my hearty love, that I wrote all this Epistle my self. You see how large a letter I have writ to you with mine own hand.* And this sense better answereth to the coherence, then that of S. Hierom, or of the other learned man whom S. Hierom wondered at. So much for the third *Lemma*.

8. I come now to the first Question *viz.* Whether it was necessarie that Scripture should be written for mens instruction?

That it was not absolutely necessarie, must be confest: for God might have used other means. He is *liberrimus agens*, *the freest agent*; or rather *ipsa libertas*, *liberty it self*, not chained to fate, not bound in with nature or second causes. Necessitie, freedome of our will, or indifferencie to either side, and contingencie, are the issues of his will.

Yea, God did use other means in the law of nature; for above 2450 yeares the Patriarchs were nourished with agraphall Tradition onely. No word was ever written till God wrote the Law, the two first Tables, the work of the onely wise Almightie; *The writing was the writing of God graven upon the Tables*, Exod. 32. 16. *Written with the finger of God*, Exod. 31. 18.

The Jews say, The book of Genesis was written by Moses, before God wrote the Law. For though God spake all

the words of the Decalogue, Exod. 20. 1. &c. yet he delivered not the Tables to Moses till Exod. 31. 18. but Exod. 24. 4. it is related, that *Moses wrote all the words of the Lord:* and vers. 7. that *he took the book of the Law, and read it in the audience of the people.* Kemnitius answereth, That the things are recorded *per Anticipationem, seu per saltum, The last is recorded in the first place:* for the writing and dedication here mentioned, were accomplished afterward, Exod. 34. 32.

The pillar of stone, and that other of brick, which Josephus *Antiq.* 1. 4. saith the children of Seth did write in before the flood, were either fictions, or apocrifal. The prophesie of Enoch was not written by him, as S. Augustine *de Civit.* 15. 23. and Origen *Hom.* 28. *in Num.* think: but *Enoch prophesied, saying,* Jude 14. As the prophesie of Adam, Genes. 2. 24. and of God himself, Genes. 3. 15. both of them concerning Christ, were spoken in Paradise, not written; and as the Apostles wrote not the Creed, but delivered it onely *viva voce, by word of mouth,* saith Irenæus, 3. 4. and Augustine *de Fide & Oper.* cap. 9. and Ruffinus on the Creed, and divers others: so is it likely, that Enochs prophesie was not written, or rather was written long after it was spoken: for writing was not so necessarie for the Patriarchs. First, *because they were more pure in minde,* saith Chrysostom, *Hom.* 1. *in Matth.* And so is the fault of our corrupt nature, and we may be rightly impleaded, that ever there was any writing, as may be gathered from Isidorus Pelusiota, *lib.* 3. *epist.* 106. Secondly, the long lives of the Patriarchs supplied the room of writing: for Methusalah, who lived 240 years with Adam (with the first Adam, *who was* ΑΥΤΟΠΤΗΣ ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ, *Bishop of those times,* saith Kemnitius *in Examine, part.* 1. *pag.* 191.) lived also 200 and odde yeares with Sem, and Sem lived 150 yeares in Jacobs time, by the calculation of Helvicus, and there were not 100 yeares from Jacobs death to the writing of the Law. Thirdly, besides such aged venerable Prophets as were Adam, Enoch, Noah, and Abraham (who was an eminent instructer with authoritie, and as it were, with a Patriarchall power: Gen. 18. 19. *I know that Abraham will command his sonnes and his houshold after him, that they keep the way of the Lord*) other Patriarchs knew the will of God by immediate revelation, by dreams and visions, *sundrie waies, at sundrie times, and in diverse manners,* Heb. 1. 1. Gods speech was in stead of writing. But when men grew more impure, and upon the increase of sinne mans dayes were shortened, God did withdraw himself, and his familiar conversation was not so common: but because their hearts of flesh were hardened, in which was printed the law of nature, by them even obliterated, and they received new evill impressions in stonie hearts, God himself wrote

wrote the Morall Law in two Tables of stone: and Gods own handie-work being broken by the occasion of their sinne, to shew that the Morall Law should continue for ever, the broken Tables were removed (and none knoweth what ever became of them) and Moses was commanded to frame two new whole Tables of stone, like the former.

Two extreams about the written word are here to be avoided: The first is of the Papists, who too much disgrace the Scripture, at least comparatively; [z] *Do you think that more sects and heresies would have bubbled up, if there had been no Scripture at all, then now are, when God hath sent us the holy Writs? I rather incline to that side, who think there would have been fewer divisions*; saith Grotser in his defence of Bellarm. *de Verb. Dei*, 4.4. Pighius *de Eccles. Hierarch.* 2.1. saith [y] *That the Apostles wrote some things, not that they might rule over our Faith and Religion, but be subject rather*: and concludeth, that the Church is not onely not inferiour, nor onely equall, but in a sort superiour to the Scriptures. The Carmelite Antonius Marinarus, in the second book of the Historie of the Councel of Trent, pag. 168. is confident, [x] *That the Church was most perfect before any Apostle wrote, and that the Church of Christ had never wanted perfection, though never any thing had been written*. Majoranus *Clyp.* 2.28. thus, [w] *The uniform consent of the Church, which never can destitute of Gods Spirit, ought more to be esteemed by us, then all the dumbe writings and volumes which are or shall be written: which have ministred matter of debate to the wits of men.* These are accursed errours, and easily confuted; because traditions are inconstant, and their number was never yet determined by themselves; but the Scripture is certain, and our Saviour both rebuketh the Pharisees for holding of traditions, Mark. 7.8, &c. Luk. 11.39. Matth. 23.18. and commandeth them to search the Scriptures, John 5.39. and referreth himself, and the whole course of his life and death to be examined by Scripture, Luke 24.25, &c.

The other extream is of such, who neglect or deride the Church and the very name thereof, because they have the written word: and these do as much glory in it, as the Jews did in the materiall Temple of Solomon, when, in truth, their contempt of the Church and its power, turns to their damnation, without repentance; and if the frequent, divine, immediate revelation had been imparted by God to us, as it was to the Patriarchs, it had been better for us: for in that illumination there was no errour, no mistaking, no doubtfulnesse, but an impossibilitie of being deceived. So that my discourse endeth in the point in which it began, The Scripture was not absolutely necessarie to be written; but *ex hypothesi*, conditionally, and supposing the divine decree, it was necessarie, yea upon

[z] *Putasne plures hæreses & sectas exortureas fuisse, si nulla penitus Scriptura extitisset, quàm nunc cùm Scriptura mortalibus à cœlo data est? Ego certè propior sum existimanti, pauciores fuisse futuras.*

[y] *Apostolos quædam scripsisse, non ut scripta illa præessent Fidei & Religioni nostræ, s.d ut subessent potiùs.*

[x] *Ecclesiam fuisse perfectissimam, priusquam Sanctorum Apostolorũ ullus scripsisset: neq; Ecclesiam Christi perfectione ullâ caruisse, etiamsi nihil unquam scripto fuisset mandatum.*

[w] *Unus Ecclesiæ consensus, qui unquam caruit Spiritu Dei, plurisapud nos esse debet, quàm omnes exingues & muti codices, & quotquot sunt & erunt unquam scripta volumina, quæ hominum ingenia semper materiam contentionis præbuerunt.*

upon corruption of manners and doctrine, it was not onely *decens, convenient*, but *ita, necessarie*: not onely the most convenient way, but the most necessarie means. Otherwise, God would never have written it. It is necessarie, if not as a cause, yet as a concause; *The word as a cause, the writing as a concause*, saith Trelcatius. The Scriptures are not simply necessarie *ad esse Ecclesiæ, to the being of a Church*; whatsoever Schappius saith; but *ad bene esse, to the well-being*: for nothing was written of the New Testament in Christs life-time, nor in some yeares after. Away with the Popish vilifying of Scripture; [c] *Matter of strife* (say they) *and not the voice of the judge*. Away with the Puritanicall cut, disdaining the Church, and the interpreters thereof (to wit, their thrice-reverend Bishops and Priests) and priding themselves in their own senseless private Spirit.

[c] *Materia litis, non vox judicis.*

The second question followeth; *viz.* Whether the holy Penmen or Actuaries wrote the Scripture casually?

I answer, If we take *casually* for *forte fortuna*, for *sole chance*, or *onely bare contingencie*, they wrote not casually:

Te facimus, Fortuna, deam, cælumque locamus:

Men think they make Fortune a goddesse (a giddie one like the people themselves) but indeed God worketh that which we call Fortune amongst men. Augustine *lib. 80. quæst. quæst. 24.* divinely reasoneth in this sort, What is done by chance, is done suddenly, or rashly: what is so done, is not done providently; but whilest providence administreth all things, nothing falls by chance in this world; if through it we look up to God, as to the universall cause by his providence: *For nothing falls under our senses, but was commanded or permitted from the invisible and intelligible Hall of the highest Emperour*, saith Augustine, *de Trin. 3. 4.*

1. Kings 22. 34. *A certain man drew a bow at a venture* (or, *in his simplicitie*) *and smote the King of Israel between the joynts of the harnesse*. What the 32 Captains of the King of Aram could not accomplish, though this were their Commission, *Fight neither with small nor great, save onely with the King of Israel*, vers. 33. that this roving arrow did by chance accomplish, and slew the bloudie Ahab: yet so by chance, as the hand of the Lord did guide it, —*Nec errantí Deus abfuit*: — and it might have been written on the shaft, before it was drawn out of the quiver, *Deus Achabo*, more certainly then what was written on the arrow that stroke out the eye of Philip of Macedon, *Asfur Philippo*.

A wealthy merchant sendeth two of his Factours, one to the East Indies, the other to the West, each of them not knowing the others employments: after certain yeares he appointeth each of them to be at such a port on such a moneth and day,

day, if they ſo can: They both meet, both wonder, both at the firſt hold it a ſtrange chance; when the deep wiſdome of their maſter providently determined all this. There is no *chance* where *providence* reigneth.

If we take *caſually* as importing counſel meerly humane led by opportunitie onely, and excluding inſpiration; as men *conſilium capiunt ex tempore, & pro re nata, Adviſe according to the freſh occurrences:* or, as *bonæ leges ex malis moribus oriuntur, Good laws are made upon former miſ-behaviour:* thus the holy Prophets, Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles wrote not caſually; for as *the Propheſie came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt*, 2. Pet. 1.21. ſo both for the Old and New Teſtament, S. Paul ſaith, *All Scripture is given by inſpiration of God*, 2. Tim. 3. 16. Is that caſuall?

If we conceive the matter thus, *The holy penmen wrote caſually*, that is, *Upon juſt occaſions, and newly emergent occurrences, the Spirit of God inſpired them to write, who otherwiſe would not have written*; I will ſay they wrote *caſually*; for *caſualtie* in this notion preſuppoſeth things done upon reaſon; and *who dareth ſay that God did ever any thing without good ground or reaſon*, ſaith the divine S. Auguſtine? They wrote *fortuitò*, ſay the Papiſts; *non fortuitò*, ſaith Vorſtius: Cleare the terms by the former diſtinction, and the queſtion is ended.

No part of Jeremie is in Chaldee, but one verſe onely; and upon what occaſion was that? *The Chaldee Paraphraſt thus relateth it*, ſaith Vatablus; *Jeremie wrote to the Elders in the Captivitie; If the Chaldean people did ſay, Houſe of Iſrael, worſhip idols; the Iſraelites ſhould anſwer, The idols which ye worſhip are idols indeed, in which is no profit: they cannot draw forth rain from heaven, or fruit out of the earth; Let them and their worſhippers periſh from the earth, and be deſtroyed from under heaven.* And to that effect ſpeak Lyra and Rabbi Solomon: but the words of God by the Prophet are thus to be rendered, Jer. 10.11. *Thus ye ſhall ſay unto them, May the gods*, or, *Let the gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, periſh from the earth, and from under theſe heavens*; Perbant, ſo the Vulgat, Vatablus, the Interlinearie, and tranſlated Chaldee: Ἀπολέσθωσαν, ſay the Septuagint. And this doth ſomewhat ammuſe me, why our laſt Engliſh Tranſlation, with others, embrace the Future tenſe, reading *They ſhall periſh*, when the words are a preſent execration of paſt, preſent, and future idols. I come to the point; If the Jews had ſaid the effect of theſe words in Hebrew, the Chaldeans could not have underſtood it; nor had it been written in Chaldee, if the Chaldeans had had no intercourſe with the Jews; and in this ſenſe that verſe was written *caſually*.

As

As Ananias and Sapphira their with-holding of things conſecrated, miniſtred occaſion to the holy Spirit, both to impart the knowledge of their ſacriledge to S. Peter, and to inſpire into him that particular propheſie, Act. 5. 9. which S. Peter otherwiſe had never ſpoken: So if Oneſimus had not been a bad ſervant, and after converted, S. Paul had not written that Epiſtle to Philemon, at leaſt not the greateſt part of it. Chemnitius, *in Examine, part.* 1. declareth at large, *Quâ occaſione, propter quam cauſam, & in quem uſum, primùm Scriptura tradita ſit à Deo:* And he ſpeaketh of the Old Teſtament.

Concerning the New Teſtament, neither Chriſt nor any of his Apoſtles wrote any thing for many yeares; nor did any one Evangeliſt or Apoſtle ſingly write, till the Church was peſtered with Schiſmaticks, *Who troubled them with words, ſubverting their ſouls*, Act. 15. 24. To remedie which diſcord, a Councel was gathered at Jeruſalem of the Apoſtles and Elders with the whole Church; and they wrote Letters, or an Epiſtle to the brethren; And, [a] *Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis, It ſeemed good to the holy Ghoſt and to us*, was the forefront of their main decree. And *this was the beginning of writing of any part of the New Teſtament*, ſaith Chemnitius in his *Examen* of the Councel of Trent, *part.* 1. *pag.* 32. though others diſſent from him. I will onely ſay, If that ſchiſme had not been, that Councel had not been gathered, that Epiſtle had not been written. Briefly thus: Euſebius in the ſecond and third book of his hiſtorie, ſpecializeth the cauſes and grounds why each of the foure Evangeliſts did write; which is exemplified by Chemnitius in the place before cited, even to ſatietie, whileſt he at large deſcribeth the occaſions, and inducements, or reaſons, why all and every book of the New Teſtament was written. Thus the concluſion being firm, That *the word of God was written caſually*, that is, *the ſacred Pen-men were inſpired to write all of it upon juſt motives, and fair occurrences*; and yet *not caſually*, if we take the word, *in ſenſu profano, & uſu forenſi:* I proceed to the third Queſtion,

Whether they were commanded to write?

They who reade the Scripture, may think this queſtion idle and impertinent: but who hath been converſant in the thornie paths of controverſies, ſhall finde much oppoſition by our adverſaries. Bellarmine, *de Verbo Dei non ſcripto*, 4. 3. ſaith thus, [b] *It is falſe that God commanded the Apoſtles to write. We have read they were commanded to preach*, Matth. 28. 19. *we have not read that they were commanded to write. God did not command expreſſely either that they ſhould write, or not write.* To the place alledged by Bellarmine, I anſwer: They are not there commanded *Prædicare*, but his verie Vulgat hath it *Docere*; which may be by writing, as well as by preaching.

[a] *Act.* 15. 28.

[b] *Falſum eſt, Deum mandâſſe Apoſtolis ut ſcriberent. Legimus mandatum ut prædicarent, ut ſcriberent nunquam legimus. Deus nec mandavit expreſsè ut ſcriberent, nec ut non ſcriberent.*

The Original hath it μαθητέυσατε, *diſcipulate*, or *diſcipulas facite omnes gentes*: where μαθητέυειν is not taken *neutro-paſſively*, for *diſcipulum eſſe*; for that implieth that the Apoſtles ſhould learn of the Gentiles, and not teach them: but *actively*, as if it were in the Conjugation HIPHIL; *ac ſi dicas*, DISCIPULARE, ſaith Beza. The very word κηρύξατε, *praedicate*, *preach*, uſed Mark 16.15. doth not neceſſarily imply onely the Apoſtolicall preaching *vivâ-voce in ſuggeſto*, *aloud in a pulpit*; but doth ſignifie a publication in generall: not onely a going up into the pulpit (as idiots imagine:) for an Angel did κηρύσσειν, Revel. 5.2. *preach*; or *proclaim*, as it is in our laſt Tranſlation: and *Chriſt preached to the ſpirits in priſon*, 1.Pet.3.19. and the poſſeſſed of a legion of devils, being diſpoſſeſſed, ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν, Mark 5.20. *Began to preach, or publiſh, how great things Jeſus had done for him.* None of theſe (I dare ſay) climbed up into the pulpit. Moreover, publication may be by writing, aſwell as by preaching; and more diſciples have been made by Evangelicall and Apoſtolicall writings, then ever were by their preachings in their own times.

I anſwer again: He ſaith, *It is falſe.* To prove a falſhood a man muſt have expreſſe truth, which he confeſſeth he hath not: and how lamely followeth this? *Becauſe we now reade it not, Ergò, they were not commanded.* He would have laught at ſuch a negative proof of ours. Auguſtine ſaith, [c] *Whatſoever Chriſt would have us reade of his words and works, that did he command the Evangeliſts, as if they had been his own hands, to write.* Bellarmine anſwereth: [d] *He ſpeaketh of the inward command, which is rather a ſuggeſtion and inſpiration then a proper command.* I reply; Of precepts properly ſo called, ſome are hid and ſecret, others more manifeſt: the internall command bindes as much as the externall; divine ſuggeſtions oft times have the force of an expreſſe inward precept; and commands are ſometimes manifeſted by inſpirations. *Praeceptum propriè dictum*, which is by word or writing, and *Imperium internum*, may be equivalent; and ſo long as it is *Imperium internum*, what need we care though it be not *Praeceptum propriè dictum?* And the command was to write, which is an outward act.

The ſecond Objection brought by Bellarmine againſt himſelf, is from the Revelation, where S. John is commanded divers times *to write.* To this he anſwereth moſt unclerk-like, That *S. John was commanded to write certain hidden viſions; not the doctrine of the Goſpel, and precepts of manners.* But this is eaſily confuted: for Revel.19.9. it is ſaid, *Write, Bleſſed are they which are called to the marriage-ſupper of the Lambe.* Is not this the doctrine of the Goſpel? what is more Evangelicall? He might have conſidered the marriage-feaſts in the Goſpels,

[c] *Quicquid Chriſtus de ſuis factis & dictis nos legere voluit, hoc ſcribendum Evangeliſtis, tanquam ſuis manibus imperavit.*

[d] *Loquitur de imperio interno, quod ſuggeſtio quaedam & inſpiratio potius quàm praeceptum propriè dictum exiſtimari debet.*

Gospels, Matth. 22. 2, &c. and Luk. 14. 16. And a voice from heaven said, Revel. 14. 13. *Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.* Are these hidden visions? Is not this the doctrine of the Gospel? The like might be amplified out of the first, second, and third chapters of the Revelation, where matters of moralitie and precepts of manners are commanded to be written, and are written; and not hidden visions, but rather the doctrine of repentance, and of the Gospel.

Christ saith to his Apostles, Act. 1. 8. *Ye shall be witnesses unto me.* He forbeareth the word of *preaching*, and useth more generall words, ἔσεσθε μοι μάρτυρες, *Ye shall be witnesses*; and they bare witnesse by writing: Joh. 21. 24. *This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his testimonie is true*; not onely he himself, but Peter and the rest, We *know that his testimonie is true*: what testimonie but his writings? [a] *He would have all his works or writings beleeved*, saith Luc. Brugensis, and Maldonate.

[a] *Totî operi suo fidem velit conciliare.*

When the seven thunders had uttered their voices, I was about to write, saith S. John, *and a voice from heaven saith, Write them not*, Revel. 10. 4. The Apostles forwardnesse or proneness to write, argueth not necessarily that he was not commanded first to write, but rather presupposeth it: and this present inhibition, *Write not*, may serve as an exception to a former generall command that he might have to write.

Indeed there is no expresse record that all and every of the Apostles were enjoyned to write: nor is it likely they were, for then they would have obeyed, whereas not the one half of the Apostles committed any thing to pen, ink, and paper, for ought we know; But we are sure that some writers of the Old Testament were commanded to write: Exod. 17. 14. *And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memoriall in a book*; Jerem. 36. 2. *Take thee a roll of a book, and write therein all the words that I have spoken unto thee*, &c. and S. John was commanded eleven or twelve times to write: and thence it is more then probable, that the rest of the Apostles which wrote were commanded to write; they might be expressely appointed to write, though in their writings so much be not expressed. To say as Bellarmine doth, *It is false that God commanded the Apostles to write, because so much is not written*, is rash and ill-advised inferring, that they were commanded nothing, except those things which are written. Is every thing false that cannot be proved? is nothing true, but what can be proved? To evince a thing to be false, is required a reall proof of truth positive, which Bellarmine wanteth: and the falsitie may justly be retorted home to the Cardinall himself, from

the authoritie of a prime man of his own part. Wiser Aquinas 3. *part. quæst.* 42. *artic.* 4. & 2. thus, *When the disciples of Christ had written what he shewed and spake unto them, we must in no wise say that Christ himself did not write, since his members wrote that which they knew by the dictate of him their Head. For whatsoever he would have us reade of his deeds and words, he commanded them as his own hands to write.* Now let Bellarmine say, *It is false, that the Apostles were commanded by God to write.* And thus much shall serve for the third question.

The fourth question. Whether the Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles were compelled to write?

As when it is said, Luke 1. 70. God Spake By The Mouth Of His Holy Prophets, *per* Loquendi *verbum*, Scriptionem *quoque comprehendit*: so what I propound of Propheticall, Evangelicall, and Apostolicall *writing*, must also be understood of their *speaking*, or *dictating*; Whether they were compelled to it?

Compulsion is of two sorts; *Proper* and *absolute*, *Improper* or *mixt*.

Proper, when a man is forced (as we say) in spight of his teeth, against his will; as some who have been drawn to punishment. Thus were they not compelled.

Mixt, when a man doth that which he would not do, unlesse he feared a greater losse; as when a Merchant or Mariner cast their goods into the sea to save their lives; which hath in it part of the voluntarie, and part of the involuntarie: And of this there may be some question; for *Jonah fled from the presence of the Lord*, Jon. 1. 3. that is, was unwilling to do the message. Moses again and again refused to be Gods embassadour to Pharaoh, Exod. 3. 11. and to the Israelites, Exod. 4. 1, 10, 13. Isaiah was also backward, Isa. 6. 5. One answer serves for all: They were at first *fearfull* rather then *unwilling*; but when they were confirmed, they readily and boldly did their duties. So farre were they from shadow of compulsion, that they offered their service. When the voice of the Lord said, *Whom shall I send?* and, *Who will go for Us?* (Isa. 6. 8.) the Prophet said, *Here am I, send me.*

Yea, but they were *impulsi, rapti, agitati, acti, vecti*, 2. Pet. 1. 21. I answer, The word rather excludeth voluntarie and arbitrarie will-worship, or self-will-service, then includeth compulsion: for all this was performed *Libero motu voluntatis*, *With the free motion of their will*: or (as others take it) *Salvo pleno usu liberi arbitrii*, *Without any impeachment of the freedome of their will.* *They who were led by the holy Ghost, spake, being inspired by God: yet know that their motions and inspirations were stirred and composed; unlike to the profane heathen priests or prophets*

* *Alii à Spiritu sancto loquuti sunt à Deo afflati, compositos tamen intellige hos motus, non quales fuere profanorum vatum.*

phets (for they were wilde, senselesse, not knowing what they did or said), saith Toemellius. Rom. 8. 14. *Many are led by the Spirit of God, Inpiritu Agantur*, is no more in effect then *ducantur*. If it had been *trahuntur*; yet *Man draweth a sheep to him*, saith Augustine: and all is farre from coaction. And this may stop the mouth of Arerius saying, out Peter 2. 1. *Moses, Elias, and others, who had rather have fled from those duties, were oft unwillingly drawn to them.*

It may be further objected Act. 4. 20. *We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.* Fond is the exposition of the Ordinary glosse, *We* Cannot, *that is, We* Will not. By such a *That is* I will confound heaven with earth. But I answer, The words imply no violence; the wills of the Apostles were not inforced: if the will of man could be compelled, it were no longer *Voluntas*, A will, but rather *Noluntas*, No will. A thing may be said *Posse, aut non posse fieri*, To be, or not to be made, these wayes:

1. *We cannot but speak*, that is, *Non possumus convenienter tacere, It is unreasonable that we should be silent. Can the children of the Bridechamber mourn?* (Matth. 9. 15.) is a question without question, for certainly they could: but while the bridegroom was with them, *they should not mourn*; that is, *It was no fit time for them to mourn.* Likewise, the Apostles could hold their peace; but then it became them not: and therefore they say, *We cannot but speak.*

2. *Non possumus licite, We cannot lawfully*: so Lyra expounds the words. *We can do nothing against the truth*, saith S. Paul, 2. Cor. 13. 8. that is, *We cannot lawfully*: unlawfully he might, and so might any other. So here, *If we do lawfully, and as we ought, We cannot but speak.*

3. *We cannot but speak*, that is, *We are very prone and apt to speak.* Matt. 12. 34. *How can ye, being evil, speak good things?* and how could the Apostles, being good, but speak good things? their souls were filled with grace, which boiled forth into words; their mouth could not choose but speak what their heart thought: *My heart was hot within me, while I was musing the fire burned; then spake I with my tongue*, Psal. 39. 3.

4. *We cannot but speak*; that is, *We speak not of our selves, but as God teacheth us:*

Est Deus in nobis; agitante calescimus illo:
When God in us doth blow, By him our heat doth grow.

He moveth us, *& mota facilius commoventur, Things fixt are not so soon moved as things in motion:* so the Apostles were silent before; but when the Spirit enlightned their understanding and framed their words, could they hold their tongues? themselves answer, *We cannot but speak.*

I summe it up all thus: It was inconvenient not to speak;

f *Herba trahit ovem.*

g *Invitis sæpe raptis sunt in hunc ordinem, Moses, Elias, & alii, qui fugæ potius hoc munus maluissent declinare.*

It was sinfull not to speak, It proceeded from the habits of grace and goodnesse that they were so prone to speak, It proceeded from the celestiall suggestion, inflaming their hearts and tongues. Therefore (say they) *We cannot but speak*. And yet away with all coaction.

Others may yet alledge the 1. Cor. 9.16. *Necessitie is laid upon me to preach the Gospel*, and verse 17. *If I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: but if against my will, a dispensation is committed unto me.* Unto the first part I answer, The necessitie is not of pressure, angariation, or force, but of precept: *Obstrictus sum ad hoc, I am commanded and bound to this*, as it is in the translated Arabick: for he was often commanded to preach. In Damascus, Act. 22.15. in the temple of Jerusalem, Act. 22.21. at Antioch, Act. 13.2. [h] *If unto the precept I adde a willing-readie heart, I have my reward*, saith Aquin. But, *I will freely sacrifice unto the Lord*, saith David, Psal. 54. 6. and S. Paul will preach rather for *love*, then *necessitie*.

The other part of the words, *against my will*, evinceth not compulsion, but backwardnesse, slownesse, and ill ends. If I preach WILLINGLY; that is, *for the love of Christ, of my self, of my brethrens soules, for Gods honour and glorie, and at his command*, I HAVE MY REWARD: But if AGAINST MY WILL, that is, *Unwillingly, or in an unwilling manner*: ([i] *If for onely servile fear I preach*, saith Aquinas) *if for fear of woe denounced against me, if for my private ends of fame or gain; yet even to such a mercenary* IS THE DISPENSATION COMMITTED. Ἄκων is opposed to ἑκών, the words *against my will*, are not so properly expounded, though it runne so in our Translation. Ἑκών is *with a good will*, as Coverdale well translates it: ἄκων signifieth a thing done *proprio motu*; therefore ἄκων is *with an ill will, grudgingly, mercenarily*. Ἄκων is *non volens, sluggishly, drawlingly, formally, for fashions sake*. I will conclude this answer with the exposition of the Arabick and Syriack Translatours: [k] *If I do this purposely, with a full will, I have my reward: if when I do it, it is harsh, unpleasant, and sowre, &c.* saith Arabs. [l] *If with my will, if besides my will*, saith Syrus. None of this tasteth of coaction.

There yet ariseth up another objection: The same Apostle saith, *The love of Christ constraineth us*, 2. Cor. 5.14. I answer, The words are diversly expounded: Urget nos, *Urgeth us*, saith the Vulgat; Cohibet nos, *Restraineth us*, saith Montanus; Continet nos, *Contineth us*, saith Oecumenius; *Incendit nos amore, Setteth us on fire with love*, saith Theodoret; *Charitas Christi constringit nos in hac sententia, The love of Christ binder us fast in this opinion*, saith Arabs: Such a constraint as would not be free; such a bond or knot as would not be untied; such a constraint as when a man is commanded to do that which he would do with-

[h] *Si voluntatem adjungo necessitati præcepti, mercedem habeo.*

[i] *Si solo timore servili prædico.*

[k] *Si facio hoc ex proposito mentis meæ, voluntate meâ, est mihi merces; si autem, cum facio, ingratum est mihi, &c.*

[l] *Si voluntate meâ, si præter voluntatem meam.*

without command, when precept is joyned to voluntarinesse, when injunction is interpoled between both precedent and subsequent willingnesse. So much for the Objections.

On the other side, for the truth these arguments stand forth.

Luke 1.3. *It seemed good unto me to write unto thee*, saith he. This proveth that the Evangelist was not compelled.

Gal. 6.11. *Perse how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand*; by which words S. Paul seeketh to ingratiate himself with them for that labour. But it was neither matter of kindenesse on his part, nor thank-worthy on their part, if he were compelled.

No man dares write in a Princes name, without his command: S. John was spoke to, advised, commanded twelve times to write: that he was compelled I reade not.

The second of Johns Epistle vers. 12. the Apostle had *many things to write*, yet *would not write with paper and ink*, or *with ink and pen*, as he phraseth it, Epist. 3. vers. 13. If he *would not*, how was he constrained?

S. Jude *gave all diligence to write*, vers. 3. so farre was he from coaction; And *it was needfull for me to write*, saith he in the same place: It was not absolutely necessarie; he saith not that he was compelled.

Divers followers of Solomon wrote his Proverbs; who coacted them?

S. Paul *wrote according to the wisdome given unto him*, 2. Pet. 3.15. Was this a power compulsive?

In the Epistle to Philemon, vers. 21. *Having confidence in thy obedience, I wrote unto thee, knowing that thou wilt also do more then I say*: which words imply, he would not have writ if he had thought Philemon would have been obstinate, or refractarie, and would have done nothing at his request: howsoever, he was free from coaction.

2. Tim. 1.5. The remembrance of the unfeigned faith in Timothie, in Lois, and Eunice, was the reason of S. Pauls writing unto him. Doth reason use violence?

By Silvanus I wrote briefly, exhorting you, saith the Apostle, 1. Pet. 5.12. Was he compelled himself, who exhorted others?

It implieth a contradiction to say simply, The will was inforced to the act of willing, saith Scotus. The will may be compelled by God or by the creature, *quantum ad actus imperatos, so farre as belongeth to the commanded acts in which the body is passive*. Joh. 21. 18. *Another shall gird thee, and carrie thee whither thou wouldest not*, saith Christ to Peter. Many are compelled to go to the Gaol, and to be hanged: but the will is induced, *quantum ad actus elicitos, by the eliciting and distilled acts*. What the holy Penmen spake or wrote, they did freely and willingly, void of compulsion.

* Simpliciter voluntatem cogi ad actum volendi, contradictio est.

The fifth question followeth, viz. Whether the holy Penmen understood all that they wrote?

Christopher Castrus on the smaller Prophets, *lib. 3. de vera futurorum cognitione, cap.* 12. handleth this point at large; and to him I owe a great part of these authorities. Montanus held that *the Patriarchs and Prophets spake in an ecstasie, not knowing what they said*; as Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 48. *contra Montanistas*, relateth. But he was an hereticke for it. The devil so moveth the tongues of the rapted or ecstaticall heathen, that they neither understand what they speak, nor have power not to speak; and their *speech is low out of the dust, and their voice out of the ground*, Isa. 29. 4. as with the Montanists their Prophetisses Prisca and Maximilla; and among the heathen the Pythonists; and divers orders of religious irreligion this day among the Turks, especially the Dervises. But *our Prophets*, saith the worthy Estius, *did speak and write, prophetical light being infused into them, and the knowledge of the mysteries inspired, and with the free motion of their will.* The Fathers run in full streams to this depth.

Origen, *Homil.* 6. *in cap.* 16. *Ezekielis*, [n] *The Prophets were in their right mindes.* And *Tom.* 6. *in Joan.* [o] *We must confesse that the Prophets understood what they spake, and carried in their lips the courteous grace of their minde.* And (*Pertarch.* 3. 3.) [p] *All the Prophets and Apostles were obedient to the words divine, without any disturbance or distraction of minde.*

Basil *in Proœmio Isaiæ*, [q] *Some say that the divinely illuminated do prophesie, their humane soul being swallowed up of the Spirit. But it abhorreth from the professed truth, and goodnesse of the divine presence, to make him a mad man who is inspired by God: and when he shall begin to be filled with divine Oracles, that then he should be out of his own wits. Is it likely or convenient that one by the Spirit of wisdome should be made most like to a mad man? Rather light stirreth up the visive facultie naturally: nor doth light breed blindenesse, nor the Spirit infuse darknesse into the mindes of men.* See the same Basil on Isaiah 13, at the beginning: Chrysostom, *Homil.* 29. *in primam Epist. ad Corinth.* 12. Hierom *in proœm. Isaiæ, & Nahum, & Abacuc, & in* 3. *cap. ad Ephes.* Augustine *de Genes. ad literam* 12. 9. and *Epist.* 112. and *contra Adamantium Manichæum, cap.* 28. Gregorie, *Moral.* 11. 12. All aim at this mark.

That they were *rapti*, or *in an ecstasie*, none denieth: but there is a double ecstasie. The first either from outward and inward senses, the minde remaining more enlightened and free and perfect: Thus were they sometimes in an ecstasie. Secondly, there is an ecstasie from the minde it self, when it understandeth not: Thus they were never in an ecstasie. So Philo Judæus in his book, *Quis rerum divinarum hæres?*

Cyril

[n] *Non excidebant mente Prophetæ.*

[o] *Fatendum est, quæ proprio ore protulerunt Prophetæ, eos intellexisse, imo labiis gestâsse animi candorem.*

[p] *Omnes Prophetæ vel Apostoli divinis responsis sine ulla mentis obturbatione ministrabant.*

[q] *Sunt qui dicunt eos extra se raptos, prophetare, humanâ mente à Spiritu absorptâ. Verum id abhorret à professione divinæ præsentiæ, ut amentem reddat qui à numine corripitur: cùm q. plenus divinorum decretorum esse cœperit, tum à propria mente excidat. Quomodo consentaneum est, ut quis ex sapientiæ Spiritu reddatur simillimus insano? Quia potiùs neque lumen cæcitatem parit, verum videndi vim à natura insitam expergefecit: nec Spiritus tenebras inducit animis.*

Cyril, *lib.* 8. *in Iouinem, cap.* 3. *'It is not alwayes necessarie that a Prophet should understand whatsoever he foretelleth. Daniel had many visions which at the first he understood not, but was after taught by an Angel; and yet he forfeited not the name of a Prophet.*

I answer with Hierom on Daniel 10. *They did know what the things signified, though they were not presently inlightened; 'that upon the delay occasion might be ministred unto them to pray oftner and more unto God, and with teares and fasting call upon him, that God would send his Angel to instruct Daniel.* So that every Prophet knew what words he spake, and knew the literall meaning of every word: but the spirituall meaning they understood not at the first, or presently, but afterwards. So Zacharie saw many things and knew them not, but asked the Angel: Zach. 6. 4. *What are these, my Lord?* And 1.9. *O my Lord, what are these?* And 4. 5, 6. *Knowest thou not what these things be? and I said, No my Lord. Then he answered and spake unto me, saying, This is, &c.* See the like in the 13 and 14 verses.

Pharaoh, Nabuchodonosor, and Caiaphas did apprehend, but not understand things divine: Prophets understood almost alwayes, saith Castrus: *Alwayes,* say I, *within a short while; so that they were never left wholly nescient of what they prophesied.*

Aquinas, 2ª, 2ª, *quæst.* 173. *artic.* 4. cometh home to me in the question propounded and in the close, though he holdeth somewhat aloof in the bodie of the Article. His *Quære* is, *Vtrùm Prophetæ semper cognoscant ea quæ prophetant? VVhether the Prophets alwayes understand all things which they prophesie?* and at first he resolveth, *'It is not necessarie that they should know whatsoever they foretell.* I confesse there is no absolute necessitie of it; and the *Non oportet* makes another distinct question: But against my position *datur instans, give me one instance.* He proves it by Caiaphas, who knew not what he prophesied. It is answered before; He was no Prophet, though he spake a propheticall sentence, no more then Balaams asse was a man, because he once discoursed more wisely then his master. Aquinas addeth, and that truely, *That the Spirit moved the mindes of the souldiers to part Christs garments, but they knew not what it signified.* But this is farre from our question: for neither were they Prophets, nor spake any propheticall sentence; but onely fulfilled one. Three Arguments he bringeth unanswerable for my opinion.

1. *Augustinus super Genes. ad literam* 12. 9. toward the beginning: *'VVho saw by the Spirits heavenly vision ill and by the glasse of bodily resemblances, unlesse there were added also the use, employment, and office of the minde, whereby these things may be understood? he deserveth not the name of a Prophet. But those things that are understood are not unknown. Therefore the Prophet is not ignorant of what he prophesieth.* 2. *Great-*

r *Non ad Prophetæ rationem id semper exigitur & necessarium est, ut quæ futura denuntiat intelligat: habuit Daniel complurium visionum quæ primùm non intellexit; sed ab Angelo postea est edoctus, & nomen Prophetæ non perdidit.*

s *Vt per moram occasio daretur, amplius Deum deprecandi, & hieremin & jejunio invocandi Deum; ut mitteret Angelum suum qui doceret Danielem.*

t *Non oportet Prophetas quæcunq; prædicunt cognoscere.*

u *Quibus figuris per aliquas rerum corporalium similitudines demonstrabatur in Spiritu, nisi accessisset mentis officium, ut etiam intelligerentur, vocandum erat prophetia. Sed ea quæ intelliguntur, non possunt esse incognita: Ergò Propheta non ignorat ea quæ propetat.*

2. [x] *Greater and brighter is the divine light of prophesie, then the light of naturall reason: But by naturall reason we are not ignorant of those things which we know: Therefore whosoever is inspired with the spirit of prophesie, cannot be ignorant of such things as he prophesieth of.*

3. [y] *Prophesie is ordained as a means to instruct and inlighten mens understandings: whereupon it is said,* 2. *Pet.* 1. 19. WE HAVE A MORE SURE WORD OF PROPHESIE, WHEREUNTO YE DO WELL THAT YE TAKE HEED, AS UNTO A LIGHT THAT SHINETH IN A DARK PLACE: *But nothing can irradiate or give light unto others, that is not illuminated in it self: Therefore it seems that a Prophet is first inlightened himself, to know those things which he fore-divineth to others.* His onely answer to the objections is, that the three reasons speak of true Prophets, whose minde is from heaven perfectly inlightened: Which is wholly my conclusion, except he differ from me in this, That the mindes of the true Prophets are not perfectly inlightened in the things which they do prophesie: which his words may insinuate, and my opinion contradicteth. It is true, that Faith is of those things that are not seen; Hope is of those things that are not had or enjoyed; Prophesie is of those things that are not, but are to come: and things to come are as easily known *lumine prophetico, by the light of prophesie*, as present colours are discerned *lumine naturali, by the light of nature:* But that prophesie is of things hidden from the true Prophet, evinceth that a *Prophet* and a *Seer* are not all one; and what I say concerning whatsoever the Prophets spake or writ, I say also of all other Penmen of holy Scripture; They knew what they spake, they knew what they wrote, even S. Paul that *heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawfull for a man to utter,* 2. Cor. 12. 4. out of doubt understood whatsoever was said unto him: He saith not, he heard words *that he could not understand*; but words *unspeakable.*

Three Objections follow: two brought by Castrus, but not answered; the third is drawn from divers passages of the Apostles.

Object. 1. Augustine, *de Civit.* 7. 33. saith, [z] *The Prophets did understand some things, and not understand other things.*

It is true, No one of them knew all things, but some things were revealed to one, some to another, in severall times, places, manners, and degrees: but Augustine will not say, that the holy Prophets were ignorant of what they prophesied themselves, and were to teach others. Elisha knew not the cause of the womans coming to him, 2. King. 4. 27. and till the minstrell played, the hand of the Lord came not on him, 2. King. 3. 15. but the same Elisha knew not onely things to come,

[x] *Major est lumen prophetiæ, quàm lumen naturalis rationis: Sed quicunque lumine naturali habet scientiam, non ignorat ea quæ scit: Ergò quicunque lumine prophetico aliqua enuntiat, non potest ea ignorare.*

[y] *Prophetia ordinatur ad hominum illuminationem: Unde dicitur,* 2. *Pet.* 1. 19. HABEMUS PROPHETICUM SERMONEM, CUI BENE FACITIS ATTENDENTES, QUASI LUCERNÆ LUCENTI IN CALIGINOSO LOCO. *Sed nihil potest alios illuminare, nisi in se sit illuminatum: Ergò videtur quòd Propheta prius illuminetur, ad cognoscendum ea quæ aliis enuntiat.*

[z] *Propheta quædam intelligebant, quædam non intelligebant.*

come, but alſo things contingent, and which did never come to paſſe: Whereas Joas ſmote but thrice upon the ground, Eliſha knew by the ſpirit of propheſie, that if Joas had ſmitten five or ſix times, then had he ſmitten Syria till he had conſumed it, 2. Kings 13.19. Now let any one think the Prophets to be parcell-ignorant in their own propheſies, I will not.

Object. 2. Ambroſe, *de Abraham*, 1. 8. ſaith, Abraham propheſied he knew not what, when he ſpake to his young men, Gen. 22.5. *Abide you here with the aſſe, and I and the lad will go yonder and worſhip, and come again to you.*

Melchior Canus, *de locis Theologicis*, 2. 4. *in initio*, ſaith, *Sunt alii quibus ego vehementer aſſentior, qui admittunt Abraham mentitum fuiſſe; Others admit that Abraham told a lie, to whom I ſtrongly adhere.* I anſwer in generall, Canus had done better if he had followed them, [a] *Who religiouſly and gravely contend* (as himſelf ſpeaketh) *that Abraham lied not.* I anſwer more particularly, The plurall might be uſed for the ſingular, or he might think reſervedly, If God will, If we both live. Either of theſe wayes is better then that of Canus. But the truth is, The father of the faithfull knew, that though himſelf did kill Iſaac, yet God who *is able of ſtones to raiſe up children unto Abraham*, Matth. 3.9. *was able to raiſe up Iſaac even from the dead*, Heb. 11.19. and in hope or full aſſurance thereof might ſay, *I and the lad will return*; and yet intend faithfully to ſacrifice his ſonne. And who knoweth but he might be divinely and extraordinarily aſſured, that his childe ſhould return with him?

[a] *Qui piè grauitérque contendunt, Abraham non eſſe mentitum.*

The third Objection conſiſteth of theſe parcels: 1. Pet. 5. 12. *By Silvanus a faithfull brother unto you, as I ſuppoſe.* 2. Cor. 11. 5. *I ſuppoſe I was not a whit behinde the very chiefeſt Apoſtles.* In both places is uſed the word λογίζομαι, *computo, ſupputo: Exiſtimo*, ſaith the Vulgat, *I ſuppoſe.* 1. Cor. 7.40. δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν. *I think I have the Spirit of God.* Joh. 21.25. *There are many other things which Jeſus did, the which if they ſhould be written, I ſuppoſe that even the world it ſelf could not contain the books that ſhould be written:* οἶμαι, *arbitror, I opine, think*, or *ſuppoſe.* From which or the like places the objection thus ariſeth; Opinion is converſant about thoſe things which are changeable, and is onely of all the powers of the ſoul buſied about contingents, and is a trembling, pendulous, ſhaking and uncertain habit, *circa complexa*: upon probable reaſons inclining to one ſide; yet fearing or doubting the contradictorie: for *opinion* is framed on *likelihood*, as *knowledge* is upon *truth.* Where *opinion* or *ſuppoſall* is, there is not *certain knowledge.* But our Apoſtles did *think* or *ſuppoſe*: Therefore they had not *immediate divine revelation* or *certaintie* in the points ſuppoſed, and therefore wrote ſomewhat which they knew not.

I anſwer

I anſwer to each of theſe Apoſtles in particular: and firſt to S. Peter, who ſeemeth to be in doubt and uncertainty what was to be thought concerning Silvanus.

Divers ſay, he ſpeaketh modeſtly of him, as the Apoſtolicall men were wont to do of themſelves. S. Auguſtine, *Tract. 37. in Joan.* averreth, that under thoſe words is couched an aſſeveration: As if one ſhould ſay to a ſtubborn ſervant, *Thou doſt contemn me: Conſider; I ſuppoſe I am thy maſter:* where the ſeeming ſuppoſall makes him neither to be, nor ſeem to be ever a whit the leſſe his maſter. But I anſwer, That the holy Ghoſt having not revealed unto S. Peter fully what the heart of Silvanus was, or was like to be, left him to ſuppoſe; and according to the ſuppoſall of his ſoul, did dictate unto S. Peter (what the bleſſed Spirit knew better then S. Peter) theſe words. The ſuppoſall of the Apoſtle inferreth not a ſuppoſall of the Spirit; The Spirit was moſt certain when the Apoſtle might be dubious: The holy Ghoſt ſpake (if I may ſo ſay) repreſenting Peter, and in Peters perſon; which might be ſubject to a ſuppoſall, and yet divinely inſpired to know certainly what he wrote, namely to know this, that he did ſuppoſe. And that upon good motives.

Whereas S. Paul ſaith, 2. Cor. 11. 5. *I ſuppoſe I was not a whit behinde the very chiefeſt Apoſtles:* and 1. Cor. 7. 40. *I think I have the Spirit of God*; he ſpeaketh not ſo much *doubtingly* as *humbly*. To uſe diminuent and ſparing phraſes concerning ones ſelf is lawfull: 2. Cor. 11. 23. *I ſpeak as a fool*, ſaith S. Paul; yet there was as great a diſſimilitude between a fool and him, as between any (I think) then breathing. Epheſ. 3. 8. Ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ, *Unto me who am leſſe then the leaſt of all Saints, is this grace given, that I ſhould preach among the Gentiles the unſearchable riches of Chriſt.* No man had the like priviledge in every degree, as he had in this. S. Peter was *Doctor Judæorum, the Doctour of the Jews*; S. Paul *Doctor Gentium, the Doctour of the Gentiles:* yet no man can ſpeak more modeſtly then S. Paul doth of himſelf: *Leſſe then the leaſt of the Apoſtles*, had been much; but *leſſe then the leaſt of all Saints*, is the depth, the heart, the ſoul of humilitie: which yet is further evidenced, in that he ſaith not, this grace was given when he was a perſecuter, and ſo indeed worſe then any Saint, yea almoſt worſe then any man; but to me even now when I am called, now when I am turned; to me now *leſſe then the leaſt of all Saints, is this grace given. Leſſe then the leaſt* is contrary to the rules of Grammar, which admit not a comparative above a ſuperlative; contrary to common ſenſe; contrary to the literall truth of the things themſelves: for he was *a choſen veſſell, a chief Apoſtle*; few (if any) more chief: *though he ſhould boaſt more of his authoritie, he ſhould not be aſhamed*, 2. Cor.

2. Cor. 10. 8. *No whit inferiour* οὐδὲν ὑστέρησα; *to the very chiefest Apostles*, 2. Cor. 12. 11. *A Minister of Christ more then others*, 2. Cor. 11. 23. Now though S. Paul used *terminis diminuentibus*, and spake sparingly and modestly in some places concerning himself; yet otherwhere he revealeth the whole truth; he knew the certaintie of things, to wit; that he was not lesse then the least, that he was not as a fool: and when he said, *I suppose*, or *I think*, he did *know*. *Dum minus dicit, majus innuit*: *Whilest he speaketh the lesse, he intimateth the more*: he was never a trumpeter of his own worth, but when he was urged unto it by opposition.

Concerning the place of S. John thus I answer: The Apostle was governed by the holy Ghost, to use an *Hyperbole*, or δοξικὸς, according to the Orientall Idiotisme; and perchance aimed at the words, Gen. 13. 6. *The land was not able to bear Abraham and Lot, that they might dwell together*: Or at the place of Amos 7. 10. *The land is not able to bear all his words*; as is well observed by the curious Heinsius. He also here is guided by the same Spirit, to write, *I suppose*, or *I think, that even the world could not contain the books*: as for other reasons to us unknown, so perhaps because both the Spirit would qualifie the *Hyperbole*, and speak within truth which is allowed, rather then beyond truth which is disallowable: *I suppose*, rather then *I know*.

Secondly; I answer more punctually; If the holy Spirit did leave S. Paul nescient, whether he were rapt in bodie, yea or no; and Paul did know his own nescience, 2. Cor. 12. 2. why might not the same Spirit leave S. Paul, S. Peter, S. John in supposals? and yet no inconvenience ariseth thencefrom, since they perfectly knew that they did suppose. *This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his testimonie is true*, John 21. 24. as S. John saith of himself.

To conclude this point; No man ever said, that whatsoever the holy Penmen mentioned or treated of, they understood perfectly, invested with all their circumstances: for they spake and writ of the day of judgement, and other secret visions, whose depths were never sounded by meer man; but sealed and reserved, perchance from Angels, till the generall judgement: yet whatsoever matter, sentences, and words they wrote, they knew as they were writers thereof, and were in no doubt of them, nor could they mistake them. As they were not omniscient on the one side; so were they not ignorant on the other side: but whatsoever they spake or wrote they knew, and knew much more then ever they spake or wrote.

The sixth question followeth, *viz.* Whether the holy Penmen did reade profane authours?

Upon the premiſſall of ſix points, the anſwer will be moſt expedite.

The firſt is this, *That diverſe Prophets and Penmen of the Old Teſtament, were Noble-men, Rulers, or Kings, cannot be denied by him, who thinketh of Iſaiahs birth of royall lineage,* ſaith Hierom, in the Prologue on him, and Lyranus from the Rabbins; or on David, Solomon, and others.

Secondly, That diverſe alſo were learned before their calling to publick place, is moſt apparent. Thus Moſes *was learned in all the wiſdome of the Egyptians, and was mightie in words and deeds,* Act. 7.22. and this before he was called to his publick charge. Thus was Job skilled in Aſtronomie, as his words declare; and Solomon the beſt Philoſopher (as I think) that ever was, except Chriſt and Adam; though Solomons great learning was rather infuſed then acquired.

The third *puncto* is, That no Penmen of the New Teſtament were Noble: And perchance even therefore our Bleſſed Saviour would write nothing by himſelf in perſon, becauſe he was of the bloud-royall. S. Hierom in his Epiſtle to Principia the Virgin, ſaith, *S. John was Noble, and for his Nobilitie known to the high Prieſt.* I anſwer, that he was very neare of kindred to our Bleſſed Saviour, and therefore Noble; but that ever he was nobly bred or brought up according to the uſance of the world, or that he was by his nobilitie made known to the high Prieſt, I ſee not proved. S. Paul ſaith, 1. Cor. 1.26. *Ye ſee your calling, brethren, how that not many wiſe men after the fleſh, not many mightie, not many noble are called:* and verſ. 28. *God hath choſen the baſe things of the world, and things which are deſpiſed.* If any one object, Though there were not many noble called, yet S. John might be one: Eſtius is peremptorie, that [b] *Not one of the twelve Apoſtles, according to the world, was wiſe, powerfull, or noble.* Ambroſe, *lib. 5. in Luc. ad illud Capitis ſexti,* 13. ELEGIT EX IPSIS, thus, [c] *Obſerve the providence of God: He choſe not any wiſe, nor rich, nor noble, but he elected fiſhers and Publicanes: and them he inſtructed, leſt he might ſeem to have drawn men unto him by worldly wiſdome, or to have redeemed them by wealth, or to have allured them to his ſide and to the participation of his grace, by the reconciling authoritie of power and nobilitie.*

The 1. Cor. 4.11. the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in the perſon of all his fellows, thus, *Even to this preſent houre we both hunger and thirſt, and are naked, and are buffetted, and have no certain dwelling place; and labour, working with our own hands, &c.* which things the Noble of this world will neither do nor ſuffer: Therefore they were not Noble.

The fourth thing premiſable is this, *None of the twelve Apoſtles were learned before their calling.* S. Paul indeed was *brought*

[b] *Inter duodecim Chriſti Apoſtolos nullus erat ſecundum ſeculum ſapiens, potens, nobilis.*

[c] *Adverte cæleſte conſilium: non ſapientes aliquos, non divites, non nobiles, ſed piſcatores & Publicanos, quos dirigeret, elegit; nè traduxiſſe prudentiâ, nè redemiſſe divitiis, nè potentiæ nobilitatiſque authoritate traxiſſe aliquos ad ſuam gratiam videretur.*

up

up at the feet of Gamaliel, Act. 22. 3. and S. Luke, as being a Physician, might be learned ere he was a Christian: the like might be surmised of S. Mark; and the rather, because we reade not that the gift of tongues was given to these two. Concerning S. Matthew, though there may be some probabilitie that he was learned before his vocation, because he sat at the receit of custome, Matth. 9. 9. for few unlearned men were gatherers of Cesars customes or tributes: and though Publicanes were vilely esteemed of among the Jews, yet divers passages of Cicero do shew, that they were of good account among the Romanes: and though more particularly it is observed, Luk. 5. 29. that *Levi* (or *Matthew*) *made Christ a great feast in his own house; and there was a great companie of Publicanes and of others that sat down with them*; whence may be inferred, that S. Matthew was a rich man; yet notwithstanding all this, he might be unlearned; and a poore man might make a great feast for joy of his extraordinarie calling. See what the young, perhaps, poore plough-man Elisha did, 1. King. 19. 21.

Joh. 7. 15. the Jews say of Christ, *How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?* The Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees knew Christ frequented not their schools, no not those at Jerusalem (for Franciscus Lucas Brugensis calleth them *Schools*) pointed at Luk. 2. 46. which were in the Temple, and at the outwardest Eastern gate of it; I say, Christ frequented them not to learn; but he at twelve yeares of age went and heard the Doctours, and asked them questions; and belike, when they could not answer, he did; or els, perhaps, he did answer to other questions propounded by them: for *all that heard him* (even they with whom he disputed) *were astonished at his understanding and answers*, Luk. 2. 47. John 7. 27. *We know this man whence he is*, say the Jews. As if one be eminent among us, we usually enquire of his parents, of his breeding, and whole course of life: so in likelihood they did of Christ: They knew his breeding in the citie of Nazareth; *Where from his childhood he used a mechanicall trade with his supposed father*, saith Pererius: They saw him not poring on books, nor turnbling them over, nor for studies sake reforting to any places where religion was taught; yet they heard him, *Legis testimonia proferentem, Alledge the words of the Law. They did not admire his doctrine* (say Chrysostom, Euthymius, and Theophylact) *nor believed they it, but they were astonished at his eloquence and learning, acknowledging them rather inspired then acquired. From whence hath this man these things? and what wisdome is this which is given unto him?* say they, Mark 6. 2. As Christ never went to any Schools, no more (in all likelihood) did any of his twelve Apostles, who being poore tradesmen, may well be thought unlettered: Matth. 4. 21. even *John, and his brother James,*

James, with their father Zebedee, were mending their nets; whereby their povertie and mean calling was described. Their ignorance is taxed by the Jews, John 7.49. *This people, who knoweth not the Law, are cursed*: where his disciples are held as illiterate ignorants. And for this cause, I think, Christ chose not either Nicodemus, or Joseph of Arimathea, or the Lawyer which offered to follow him, or Scribe, Priest, or Pharisee, to be any one of his Apostles; that Apostolicall learning might be rather Divine, then Humane: in which regard also, perhaps, he chose none of the Doctours with whom he argued: sure I am, S. Augustine saith, for this very cause Nathanael was not numbred among the twelve Apostles, *Quia doctus erat in lege, Because he was a learned Lawyer*; though otherwise Nathanael was a most accomplished man. Act. 4. 13. it is said, That the high Priests, Rulers, and Elders *perceived that Peter and John were unlearned and ignorant men*: Unlearned in the knowledge of things themselves; ignorant in skilfull speaking; simple men both for matter and manner. And *this the Jews perceived, that is, by disquisition found out*, saith Lorinus.

Augustine, *de Verb. Domini, Serm.* 59. *Tom.* 10. [d] *Great was the mercie of Christ: He knew if he had chosen a Senatour, the Senatour would have said, I was chosen for my place and dignitie: If an Oratour, he would have pleaded, My eloquence hath made me regarded: If a Philosopher, My wisdome caused me to be chosen. Give me the Fisherman. Come thou poore man; thou hast nothing, knowest nothing; follow me. Put me an empty vessel where is so great a spring. The words of Fishermen are read onely, and the necks of Orators are subject unto them.* Or (as Athanasius, *de Incarnat. & Sacrament. cap.* 9. hath it) [e] *The plain down-right truth of Fishermen, hath thrust out of doores the oratorie of Philosophers.*

Lorinus, on Act. 1. 26. relateth the opinion of Antoninus, thus, *That Christ whilest he lived chose rude and illiterate men, lest the conversion of the world should be attributed to humane industry and wisdome: yet the Apostles chose the learned Matthias, to insinuate unto the succeeding Churches, That not idiots, but skilfull men were to be chosen Governours of soules; Yea, even Christ himself from heaven, vocally called the learned S. Paul.* And so I shake hands with this point.

The fifth followeth, *viz.* That it was lawfull for them, and is for others, to reade, or seek profane Authours.

The arts are as handmaids to Divinitie. Clemens Alexandrinus, *primo Stromat.* saith, [f] *The arts are as a Schoolmaster to bring the Gentiles to Christ, as the Law was to the Jews.* Though the Apostle saith, *Beware lest any man spoil you through Philosophie*, (Col. 2. 8.) yet it is that Philosophie which is joyned with vain deceit. *True Philosophie is a branch plucked from the eternal Veritie* (saith Clemens in the same place) *and is the childe of rectified reason.* But [g] *even Jupiter is ruled by good reason*, saith

[d] *Magna artificis misericordia: sciebat enim, quòd si eligeret Senatorem, diceret Senator, Dignitas mea electa est: si Oratorem, Eloquentia mea: si Philosophum, Sapientia mea electa est. Da mihi istum piscatorem: veni tu pauper, nihil habes, nihil vestis, sequere me. Tam largo fonti vas inane admovendum est. Leguntur modò verba piscatorum, & subdantur colla Oratorum.*

[e] *Verba Philosophorum excludit simplex veritas piscatorum.*

[f] *Non minùs literæ illæ Gentilibus ad Christum pædagogi vicem, quàm legem Judæis esse*

[g] *Recta ratio est lex summi Jovis.*

saith Cicero: and Tertullian, more African-like, [b] *God and reason are at one.* When any Fathers tax Philosophie, it is because it commeth too nigh the Mountain, and intermingleth with Divinitie: otherwise, it is lawfull to use it, or any other profane authoritie. See it proved by Nicephorus, 10.26. Gregorie Nazianzen defendeth S. Basil for his learning in Ethnicks, and censureth those that condemn it, saying, *The aire, the earth, are not to be contemned, because some have abused them. Fire, meat, iron, & other things,* [i] *of themselves are neither profitable nor harmfull, but as they are used. As we make Theriacall medicaments of creeping things: so let us choose the good things out of them, and contemn the bad;* [k] *making the profane things to be sanctified and ecclesiasticall,* saith Origen, *Homil. 31. in Luc.* Hierom well observeth in the beginning of his Commentaries on Daniel, and in his Preface on Job, That, if you look over all the books of Philosophie, you must needs finde in them [l] *some part of the chosen truths of God.* In Plato, God to be the Architect of the world: in the Stoicall Zeno, Hell, and the immortalitie of souls. *We are to vindicate their good things from them, as from unjust possessours, and to transfer the spoils of Egypt to our selves,* as Augustine sweetly alludeth, *de doctr. Christ.* 2.40. When Rufinus accused Hierom for using in his letters humane learning, Hierom *Epist. 8.* answereth, That *that is to kill Goliah with his own sword,* 1. Sam. 17.51. *Let Philosophie submit her self, as Agar to Sara,* saith Clemens *ibid.* Let the captive womans head be shaved, and her nails pared, Deut. 21.12. If the handmaid be obstinate, *Cast out this bondwoman and her sonne,* Gen. 21.10. [m] *Why do we refuse secular learning, without which we cannot comprehend things divine?* saith Tertullian, *de Idololat.* And Aquinas most divinely in his disputed questions *de fide, Art.* 10. [n] *Divinitie is never contrarie to true naturall reason, but often excelleth it; and so going beyond it, doth seem to thwart it.* And so this fifth point, *That it was and is lawfull to reade profane Authours,* is the rather concluded, because it shall be confirmed by the sixth,

The holy Penmen did cite Poets or profane Authours. Titus 1.12. *One of themselves, even a Prophet of their own, said,*

Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

Cretenses semper mendaces, mala bestia, ventres pigri:

The Cretians are alway liars, evill beasts, slow bellies.

Epimenides the Cretian in his book περὶ χρησμῶν, *de Oraculis*, hath the whole Hexameter. Callimachus came after him, and from him took the Hemistich. But the whole verse was not taken by S. Paul from Callimachus, because the whole verse was not intire in Callimachus. Besides, *Callimachus was of Cyrene, not of Creet.* The learned Estius is my authour.

The same S. Paul cites this (as it is Act. 17.28,29.) *In him*

[b] *Res Dei Ratio.*

[i] *Per se sunt neque utilia neque noxia.*

[k] *Sanctificantes profana & facientes ecclesiastica.*

[l] *Aliquam partem vasorum Dei.*

[m] *Quomodo repudiamus seculares studia, sive quibus divina esse non possunt?*

[n] *Rationi naturali vera nunquam contrariatur Theologia; sed eam excedit sæpe; & sic videtur repugnare.*

we live, move, and have our being, as certain alſo of your own Poets have ſaid: For we are alſo his off-ſpring. In which diſcourſe S. Paul inſiſts in the writings of diverſe of their Prophets. Firſt, verſ. 24. *God made the world, and all things therein*; which almoſt all Heathen acknowledged, and many have publiſhed: verſ. 26. *He hath made of one blood all nations of men:* Orpheus compriſed both of them before in few words,

Unus perfectus per ſe; ex uno omnia facta.

He is one and perfect of himſelf; and by or *of that one were all things made.* Verſ. 28. ſeemeth to be taken from Xenophanes Colophonius, who cometh home to that point, as he is cited by Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromat.* 5. or els from Orpheus, who acknowledgeth that in God

——— cuncta moventur,

Ignis, aqua, & tellus,———

All things are moved, Fire, water, earth.

Concerning thoſe words, verſ. 29. *We are his off-ſpring*, they are the very words of Aratus in the beginning almoſt of his φαινόμενα· Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν, *Ipſius enim genus ſumus. We are his off-ſpring.* Clemens *Strom.* 5. and Vaſques, *Tom.* 1. *part.* 1. *diſput.* 28. *num.* 17. expound it, as if we were his *Genus Creatione*, *By creation.* That is true, but not enough: for *Genus* may be taken for *Soboles*, *an off-ſpring*; and men may be ſaid to be Διογενεῖς, *Jovis proles*, *Born of God*, *The iſſue of God*; or, as another hath it to an other purpoſe,

Semideique homines, ſemihominéſque dei.

Men half gods, and gods half men.

Another place in S. Paul, is 1. Cor. 15. 33. φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίαι κακαί·

Evil communications corrupt good manners.

Tertullian, *ad uxorem*, 1. 7. ſaith, *This verſicle was ſanctified by the Apoſtle.* Hierom, *ad Demetriad. virg. Epiſt.* 8. *cap.* 10. ſaith, *S. Paul aſſuming this ſecular verſe, made it Eccleſiaſticall.* Socrates, 3. 40. and out of him Nicephorus 10. 26. ſay, *It is borrowed from Euripides.* Hierom, Peter Martyr, and many mo report it to be *Semarius Menandri*, *an Hexameter of Menander:* I reconcile them thus, That it is in both of the Poets. Juſtinian the Jeſuite relateth, that Photius, *apud Oecumenium*, ſaith, *Some ſuch thing is in the Prophet Iſaiah*; But *I could never finde it*, ſaith the Jeſuite. Perhaps he miſtook Photius; for if Photius had any relation to the precedent words, verſ. 32. *Let us eat and drink, for to morrow we die*, the Jeſuite might finde the ſame Iſa. 22. 13. And ſo Athanaſius, on the place of the Apoſtle (or rather Theophylact, if we beleeve Bellarmine, *de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis, ad annum* 340 *in Athanaſio*) ſaith, *Theſe words were taken from Iſaiah.*

Acts 20. 28. *Take heed unto your ſelves, and to all the flock;*

Atten-

Attendite vobis, &c. That Thales Milesius was the first that said, *Non sine oculo Domini (.i. attentione) equum, non sine vestigio Domini, (id est, attentione) agrum pingue fieri,* was a good observation of Bishop Andrews in his *Concio ad Clerum, in Synodo Provinciali, pag.* 29: but that grave Prelates intimation (for indeed at the utmost it is no more) that Paul alluded to that saying of Thales, is a conjecture farre enough fetched. *Eodémque in loco, Paulus (jam Milesius) Nec, sine attentione, bene esse Ecclesia dicit.* So he. Much more may be said to the point concerning the Apostles citing Apocryphall, or not Canonicall writings.

S. Paul knew the names of Pharaoh his Magicians, 2. Tim. 3. 8. *Jannes and Jambres*, as we reade it according to the Greek and Syriack; which is also followed by Numenius *apud Euseb. de præparat. Evangel. 9. 3.* though the Vulgat hath *Mambres* in stead of *Jambres*, and the Hebrew Talmud, and Rabbi Nathan, as Genebrard cites them in the first book of his Chronologie. [o] *It is commonly thought that the Apostle took from the Talmud the names of Pharaohs chief Magicians*, saith Drusius, *in Henoch, pag.* 25. and in the margin, [p] *It is more credible the Apostle took it out of an Apocryphall book, called* JANNES AND JAMBRES: *for from thence the Talmud fetched it*, saith Drusius. I for my part will not define whether S. Paul was onely immediately from heaven assured, that these were the names of the Magicians, or whether he had read their names also in some Apocryphall book now perished, or in the Talmud.

[o] *Apostolus è Talmud habet nomina principum magorum Pharaonis, ut communis opinio est.*

[p] *Credibilius est, ipsum sumpsisse ex libro Apocrypho, qui Jannes & Mambres vocatur; nam Talmud hinc habuit.*

James 1. 17. Πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ, καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον, &c. *Every good gift, and every perfect gift is from above:* Which words I have both heard and read alledged for the lawfull use of humane literature; though I, for my part, cannot guesse whence the Apostle took them.

That S. Jude had the historie of the strife between Michael and the devil, about the bodie of Moses (the 9 of Jude) in part from Deuteronomie; and in part from an Apochryphall book, Aretius maintaineth. The title of the book was *Assumptio Mosis, The assumption of Moses* (as some say;) or, *Ascensio Mosis, The ascent of Moses*, as others say. That S. Jude might also have read the book of Henoch and his prophesie, I will not denie: for he citeth some words of it, vers. 14. So think Hierom *in Catalogo*, and in his Commentarie on Titus 1. Augustine *de Civitat.* 15. 23. & *ibid.* 18. 38. and Beda on the place. But the book of Henoch is Apocryphall.

That S. John read the Targumists, in many places, the learned Heinsius proveth or laboureth to prove by many passages. Thus much clearly must be confest, that the gifts both of reading, and of writing, and understanding of strange tongues

was conferred on all the Apoſtles; not one was an illiterate man, after the *cloven tongues like as of fire ſat upon each of them*, Act. 2.3. and I make no queſtion but they alſo read the Old Teſtament, after that time, and might reade other books, Talmudiſts, Targumiſts, Helleniſts, Apocryphall books, yea Heathen writings; and perhaps did ſo.

But in all theſe or the like places, which the Apoſtles cited or pointed at, this is now my laſt reſolution, as a Corollarie to the Queſtion before briefly anſwered,

Either the ſacred Penmen never read thoſe things themſelves, but the all-knowing Spirit did tender and dictate both matter and words to them: Or if they did reade profane authours, and were converſant in them; yet they uſed the words, not as their own reading, not as humane learning, not as drawn out of the treaſurie of their own memories, not as if they had the choice to inſert thoſe ſentences above others; but the holy Ghoſts inſpiration guided them wholly, and reached forth words unto them, both in things which they knew, and in things unknown unto them before.

Yea, I beleeve, that if Plato, or Ariſtotle, Tullie, or Varro had lived after Chriſts dayes, and been called to write any part of Scripture, they ſhould not, would not have conceived one thought, or written one word of humane literature, as from themſelves, or any part of their own great knowledge; but would have quitted themſelves, and been wholly led by the holy Ghoſt.

The ſeventh Queſtion. Whether they ſtudied the things before-hand?

That both Prophets, Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts, were filled with holy thoughts, and heavenly meditations, we certainly beleeve and know. Pſal. 45. 1. *My heart is enditing of a good matter*; or (as it is in our margin) *boyleth*, or *bubbleth up a good matter: Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum*, ſaith the Vulgat; *Verily good thoughts were in my heart*: The like I ſay of all, and every of them. Pſal. 39.2. *I was dumbe with ſilence, I held my peace even from good, and my ſorrow was ſtirred*: and verſ. 3. *My heart was hot within me, while I was muſing the fire burned; then ſpake I with my tongue*: and verſ. 4. *Lord, make me to know mine end*. From whence appeareth, that David was premeditating, as other people do; and at the laſt, as other mens, his thoughts brake forth. The ſimilitude is taken from ſorrow and grief, which being for a while ſuppreſſed, groweth greater; or from fire, which being ſmothered, or half quenched with water, upon recovery of its ſtrength, groweth farre more violent. The anſwer is, that David relateth what courſe he took when he could not exonerate and alleviate his ſoul by conference with men, whoſe wayes he liked not: *He poured*

out

out his complaints and prayers unto God. So Musculus. And this no doubt did the Spirit of God stirre him up to do. It pleased the holy Ghost to make those thoughts of David, which before were pure and divine, yet private, now to be divine, publick, and canonicall.

Again, That they might conceive and understand by the Spirit, a great deal more then the holy Ghost would have to be written, I denie not: and on such things they might muse.

Yet I conjecture, that what they wrote in holy Scripture, they studied not before-hand (the Spirit hath no need of mans studie or learning) and I do remove from every part of it, all humane premeditation; and maintain, that the Spirit did frame both matter and words (as by Gods grace shall anon appeare) *pro re nata, as occasion offered it self.*

One chief reason may be this, That nature, which is the right hand of God, hath greatest care of greatest matters, and lesse of least, and equall care of things equall. If the Apostolicall and Evangelicall writings are not (*considenatis considerandis, weighing one thing with an other*) of more esteem then their words were; yet let them go as equivalent: Then Christ will have as much care of their writings as of their speaking: But their speeches were without premeditation, and were commanded so to be: Therefore all their writings. Matth. 10. 19. *Take no thought how, or what ye shall speak:* you see both the matter and manner is not to be from them. *For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you,* vers. 20. *Not they,* there is the negative; *but the Spirit,* there is the positive. Likewise, Mark 13. 11. *Take no thought before-hand, ——neither do ye premeditate:* An absolute inhibition; and it had been a great sinne to transgresse it, and a distrust of the holy Ghost. The like I say concerning all their writings.

They might have indeed in their meditation before-hand divers of those things which afterwards they wrote: but when they thought on them, they knew not they should write them, and when they did write, they wrote them not as copies or extracts of former conceits out of the wombe of their own memories; but as freshly and newly inspired, apprehended, indited, and dictated unto them.

There is one kinde of knowledge proceeding from principles known by the naturall light of the intellect: as Arithmetick, Geometrie, &c. Others proceed out of principles known by light of an higher knowledge: as Perspective, from the principles evinced by Geometrie; and Musick, from principles known by Arithmetick: *So is the Scripture beleeved by an higher light, even by the revelation of God,* saith Aquin. *part.* 1. *quæst.* 1. *art.* 2. and not beleeved onely; but the matter, and manner, and words proceeded from a diviner understanding,

then

then humane conceit could reach unto, and were written by an higher and better hand then the hand of man. All was the holy Spirits doing, even the leading of their hands whilest they wrote, that they could not erre.

Cornelius Cornelii à Lapide, on 2. Tim. 3. 16. thus, *The Spirit did not dictate all Scripture after one manner. The Law and the Propheſies are revealed and dictated to a word; the Hiſtories and Morall exercitations, which before by ſight, hearing, reading, or meditation the holy Writers had learned, there was no neceſſitie to be inſpired, or dictated from the Spirit, ſince they knew them alreadie: So John 19. 35. He that ſaw it, bare record. and Luk. 1. 3. It ſeemed good to me alſo, having had perfect underſtanding of all things from the very firſt, to write unto thee in order.* Then doth he mince, modifie, and qualifie his former ſaying, in this manner; *But the holy Spirit may be ſaid to have dictated even the latter alſo: Firſt, becauſe* q *he was preſent whileſt they wrote, that they could not go one jot from the truth. Secondly, becauſe it ſtirred them up, and ſuggeſted that they ſhould write this rather then that:* r *Therefore the conceptions and remembrance of ſuch things as they knew, the Spirit did not inſpire into them.* Thirdly, ſaith he, *The Spirit did order, direct, and methodize all their conceits, that they might put this in the firſt, that in the ſecond, another in the third place.* In which words of his three things deſerve cenſure, even the ſtrict cenſure of the Inquiſition.

q *Aſſitis ſcribentibus ne vel in puncto à veritate aberrarent.*

r *Conceptum ergo; & memoriam eorum quæ ſciebant, non iis ingeſſit Spiritus Sanctus.*

First, That the Spirit did not dictate all Scripture after one manner.

I anſwer, Then all is not of a like dignitie: that which is after the divineſt manner, is to be held beſt: that wherein there is a medly of divine and humane knowledge and wiſdome, is of an inferiour ſort. But this may not be granted, for, *All Scripture is of divine inſpiration.* Excellently ſaith Doctour Eſtius on 2. Tim. 3. 16. *Rightly and moſt truely from hence do we conclude, that all the ſacred Canonicall Scripture was written by the dictate of the holy Spirit;* (not in that manner, ſay I, that he left the Pennen to their own memories and knowledge, which as humane were weak and imperfect;) but s *ſo, that not onely the ſentences, but every word, and the order, placing, and the whole diſpoſing of the words was from God, as ſpeaking or writing by himſelf.* But God (I dare ſay) hath no need of their memories; nor his writing or ſpeech, of their hearing, reading, ſight, or premeditation.

s *Ità vimirum, ut non ſolùm ſententiæ, ſed & verba ſingula, & verborum ordo, ac tota diſpoſitio ſit à Deo, tanquam per ſemetipſum loquente aut ſcribente.*

Secondly, he is to be taxed for ſaying, there was no neceſſitie that things Morall and Hiſtoricall ſhould be inſpired.

I ſay, there was a neceſſitie that hiſtories and moralities ſhould be inſpired, if they are to be parts of the ſacred Writ: otherwiſe, this knowledge and writing are onely parcels of humane learning. Though S. John bare record to what he ſaw, his

his bearing record without the Spirit, had been but an ordinary testimonie. Not his saying, but the inspiration makes the record divine; and his testimonie from the Spirit, That he saw, is of more force then his testimonie could be to the Spirit, What he saw. *It seemeth good unto us*, saith S. Luke, but it was made to seem good unto him by the Spirit: yea, first it seemed good unto the holy Ghost; as the Apostles in the like case said, Act. 15. 28. *It seemed good unto the holy Ghost, and to us*. The words do not notifie the pleasing of his own fancie, without the dictate of the holy Ghost, say I. And the understanding that he had of things from the first, was not by sight; for he was not then called; not by humane relation; for that may be mistaken, increased, or decreased, or subject to errour. But the knowledge issued out from the light divine; and therefore is there learned *perfect understanding*, like Gods gifts, James 1. 17. All other guides are somewhat imperfect.

Thirdly, the Jesuite is justly blameable for saying, The Spirit need not tell them what they knew before.

I say, they might have forgotten or mistaken some things, as they were men, and by the Spirit they might know more certainly, what they knew before more doubtingly; and by the same Spirit they might know some circumstances more then before they knew: what they knew *humanely*, they now know *divinely*.

I will not discusse the question at large, Whether the Law written by the hand and finger of God immediately, were to be regarded above other things divinely inspired into holy men, and written by them. This I will say, That if I were ascertained that I saw the very tables, the latter tables of stone which God himself wrote; or if I had seen any thing which Christ himself had written (for I will not say he wrote nothing; and I know he could write) I should prefer them somewhat above whatsoever should be transcribed or written by any other whosoever; and this is my reason; Though Moses his writings were inspired and dictated from God; yet he placed them in the side of the Ark, Deut. 31. 26. a place not altogether so noble: (see Cajetan on Heb. 9.) but the tables, and onely the tables written by Gods own finger, were laid up in the Ark it self; as appeareth, 1. Kings 8. 9. and 2. Chron. 5. 10. howsoever afterward it seemeth there was a change, Hebr. 9. 4.

At length I am come to the five Conclusions, which bear directly upon the learned Heinsius: whereof the first is this,

There was no difference between the Penmen of the divine Writ of the Old and New Testament in the point of conceiving and writing in different Languages. Which in this manner I do explain;

If

If I demand of the worthy Heinsius, in what tongue the Old Testament was conceived: his answer is peremptorie, *Prolegom. pag. 26.* [t] *It was conceived in the Hebrew and Chaldee language.* It had been clearer if he had used some disjunctive, rather then a copulative Preposition. For none will imagine that the skilfull Heinsius did ever mean, that all of the Old Testament was conceived both in Hebrew and in Chaldee, to which his words seem to incline: but either in Hebrew or in Chaldee was it conceived; and they who wrote in Hebrew conceived in Hebrew, and they who wrote in Chaldee conceived in Chaldee. I do not think but he would thus have expressed himself, and explained his own meaning, if he had been put unto it. Whereupon I discourse in this manner: Jeremie wrote somewhat in Chaldee, and Daniel wrote some chapters: If they being Hebrews or Jews by generation and birth, and perfect in their mother-tongue, readie Scribes in the law of Moses, as well as Ezra, Ezra 7.6. did yet conceive in the Chaldee, that Chaldee which they wrote (which the ingenuous Heinsius will not denie: for what was conceived in Chaldee, if that which was written in Chaldee was not so conceived?) why did not the Writers of the New Testament, though they were born and bred in the use of the Syriack, conceive in Greek what they wrote in Greek? What reason have we to discriminate them: so that the Penmen of the Old, shall conceive and write in one and the same language, the Chaldee in Chaldee, and Hebrew in Hebrew, and not the Penmen of the New Testament: but they (forsooth) must conceive in Syriack, and write or dictate in Greek? especially since all of them conceived and wrote by the inspiration and dictate of one and the same Spirit? Either let him make the forenamed passages of the Chaldee language in the Old Testament to be conceived in Hebrew, though writ in Chaldee; and so none at all to be conceived in Chaldee: or let him equall the Penmen of the New Law to those of the Old in this point, That they wrote in the self-same tongue in which they conceived.

Besides, it will be hard to prove, that Jeremie ever knew any part of the Chaldean language, till that very verse was inspired into him: and so with it, both the knowledge, and the words, and the power both of pronuntiation and of writing. So that Jeremie could not possibly conceive and utter also the Chaldee in the Hebrew; but conceived that verse in Chaldee, and in Chaldee pronounced or wrote it.

A second errour in the learned Heinsius, *Pag. 49. Prolegom.* is this, [u] *Wherefore we must rest not on the allusions which now are, but which S. John conceived in his minde.*

Against which I set down the second Conclusion; *viz.*

We

[t] *Hebraïcè ac Chaldaïcè conceptum est linguâ.*

[u] *Quare ad allusiones, non quæ extant, sed quas animo conceperat Joannes, eundum est.*

We muſt have recourſe to the alluſions which are. S. John was *Sol Evangelii, The light, the ſunſhine, the very Sunne of the Goſpel*, as Dionyſius termed him. This Sunne is in eclipſe, and we have not, cannot have his true and perfect light, if we muſt not look to his rayes and ſhine, which are his words; but to his thoughts, that is, the light which is in himſelf; to his *internall* and *ſubſtantiall* light, and not to the *externall*.

The certaineſt rule is moſt to be truſted unto: therefore let us not go from the words and extant alluſions which we know, to the thoughts of S. John which we know not. For; *Who knoweth the thoughts of a man, ſave the ſpirit of man which is in him?* 1. Cor. 2. 11. And if the finite thought of every man be unknown, can the thoughts of him, who is inſpired by the infinite Spirit, be ſo ſoon and ſo eaſily known? Moreover, the ſame words written in Greek may be conceived two or three wayes in the Syriack: for variations are in that language, and different expreſſions of the ſame things; And which of thoſe ſhall we think was the conceit of S. John? And when we have lighted on divers, and all of them good expreſſions of Syriack; yet the Spirit might guide S. John to an other, which we never thought upon: And ſo we are for ever uncertain what alluſion S. John conceived in his thoughts. For he conceived more by the boundleſſe power of the divine inſpiration, then we can poſſibly reach unto: and there was never place of Scripture ſo, ſince the Apoſtles dayes, expounded, (if before) that I dare ſay, The Spirit aimed at nothing elſe, and all is known. All known good expoſitions may be ſaid to be of the Spirit, but the Spirit hath many depths which never yet were ſearched. Therefore our anchor-hold muſt be on the words; or elſe we ſhall flote in the wide vaſt ſea of imagination and phanſie, without ſail, oar, or rudder, without card or compaſſe; by having recourſe to the *Non entes*, or *Non extantes alluſiones*, *Unextant alluſions*, which were in the thoughts of our bleſſed Apoſtle. It is no rule or canon which is not extant. *Non Ens* is an ill guide to *Ens*.

Beſides, the Syriack now much differeth from that in the Apoſtles dayes: how then can we finde out, what the Apoſtle conceived? For the Syriack and Arabick now in uſe (except perhaps the Goſpel of S. Matthew, and the Epiſtle to the Hebrews) were tranſlated out of the Greek, and not the Greek out of theſe. Had we exactly the identicall αὐτόγραφα, *firſt originall manuſcripts*, in which S. Matthew wrote his Goſpel, and S. Paul his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, in the Hebrew or Syriack, had we the true ſelf-ſame paper or parchment, in which the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles or their *amanuenſes* wrote the divine dictates; we might better gueſſe at their thoughts and the alluſions to which they bended themſelves. But now

Heinsius would have us to shoot at covers; or rather to no steadie mark at all, at the then thoughts of our Apostle.

Lastly, the worthy Heinsius doth a little interfere, when he counselleth us to go to the allusions which were in the thoughts of the Apostles, and not to the allusions which are extant: For suppose I grant that he hath found whatsoever the Apostle alluded to in his minde; is not this now extant? Or can a thing be found which is not extant?

The third conclusion trenching upon Heinsius is this,

They had no libertie left unto them to put in their own conceits, or in writing to adde or blot out what they had done.

This point concerneth the matter which is written.

Peter Moulin in his third Epistle to Bishop Andrews, as it is in the 18a page of the said Bishops *Opuscula*, wrote thus; [a] *What things soever concern faith or salvation, they were determined by the Apostles under the guidance of divine inspirations. In other things they often used their own discretion and prudence, as S. Paul intimateth*, 1. Cor. 7. 25. The grave and profound Oracle thus answereth him, pag. 193. [b] *I pray you speak more sparingly of this point, viz. That the Apostles used their own wisdome or prudence; for it is dangerous to say or write, that the Apostles were in some things inspired from heaven; in the rest often used their own counsel and prudence, and that in matters which are found written in the Scripture. But you know it is concluded immediately after these words,* ACCORDING TO MY OPINION, *or judgement;* AND I THINK ALSO THAT I HAVE THE SPIRIT OF GOD, 1. *Cor.* 7. 40. *So that his very opinion or judgement, had its dictate from the Spirit of God.* Again, *If the place cited were not inspired, but written in humane prudence; we must note it as Apocryphal. Then let us make an expurgatorie index of the New Testament. For we must separate that which is precious from that which is vile. Things of humane wisdome will never stand mixed with things divinely inspired.* So farre he. Enough indeed for an Epistle; but I could have wished that the most learned walking-librarie had more fully answered all the objections which do most forcibly arietate the truth; especially such as are couched in the same chapter, which is cited by Peter Moulin. If I come upon the stage after Roscius, I look not for praise, but pardon. Let us muster up all their forces together: and since that famous Bishop hath withstood the utmost of their strength in the first brunt; the rest will (like the French furie in warre) be the easier answered.

The first objection is, 1. Cor. 7. 6. *I speak this by permission, and not of commandment.*

The second objection is, vers. 10. *Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord:* as if he had said, A common man may speak, and both deceive, and be deceived; but I say these things being taught of God. The

[a] *Quæ ad salutem & fidem pertinent, ab Apostolis statuta sunt afflatu divino; in cæteris, sæpe usi sunt suâ prudentiâ, ut innuit Paulus.*

[b] *Parcius iste, de Apostolis, prudentiâ suâ usis: periculosè enim vel dicitur, vel scribitur, Apostolos in Quibusdam afflatu divino, in reliquis sua prudentiâ sapere usos; idq; in iis quæ scripta reperiuntur. Atqui vel illum ipsum locum, ubi κρίνω ἐμὴν γνώμην, scis ità concludi, δοκῶ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν ità ut vel illius γνώμη, à Spiritu Dei dictamen suum habuerit.*

The third objection is, vers. 12. *To the rest speak I, not the Lord.*

The fourth objection, vers. 25. *Concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgement, as one that hath obtained mercie of the Lord to be faithfull.*

The fifth objection, vers. 40. *She is happier, if she so abide, after my judgement, and I think also that I have the Spirit of God.*

To the first I thus answer, The Apostle meaneth not, that he was permitted onely to write or speak some things, and commanded to write other things: nor touched it any part of his thought, to permit a little sinne, that a greater might be avoided, as some hence maintain; [c] *Whilest he forgiveth them, he granteth they were faults*, saith Augustine concerning these words, *in lib. de pecc. merit. & remiss. cap. 28.* Again, *de bono Conjugali, cap. 10.* [d] *It is most absurd to say, They sinned not whom pardon absolveth.* Again, *in Enchir. cap. 78.* [e] *Who can denie there is a fault, where the Apostle confesseth that the doers thereof were forgiven?* I answer, Erasmus saith, some Copies have it κατὰ γνώμην, and not κατὰ συγγνώμην, *secundum indulgentiam*, as Augustine and others reade: and then the sense is, *I tell you my opinion*, or *This is my advice; I leave you to your selves, I do not command it; God maketh not it a matter of precept, but thus I advise or counsel:* and then it soundeth all one with that in the 25. verse, where the Apostle saith, γνώμην δίδωμι, *sententiam do*; and vers. 40. κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην. [f] *Leaving every man to his own libertie in this point*, saith Erasmus.

Secondly, I wonder that that holy Father could think S. Paul would permit the least sinne, when Rom. 3. 8. he counteth them slanderous reporters that affirmed he said, *Let us do evil that good may come*; adding, *their damnation was just.*

Again, if it be read κατὰ συγγνώμην, our English well translateth it, *By permission:* and the Arabick expounds it by κατὰ συγχώρησιν, *By my concession:* [g] *Nor speak I it as a finall sentence or binding decision*, as Beza hath it. The Arabick of Junius hath it, κατὰ συμφωνίαν, *With mutuall consent*: and thus enlargeth it; [h] *Whereas I say, One may depart from another by consent for a time, that they may fast the more, and pray the better; I command not this, but advise it. For even God himself never gave charge unto any of his, that this should be done commonly, and kept perpetually: but he hath given us an example agreeable to my counsel, that it may be done sometimes for a while upon extraordinary occasion.* Exod. 19. 15. *Come not at your wives.* The translated words of the Arabick by Junius are these, [i] *This is the advice, not the decree of the Law.* Beza makes the sense of the words to be, as if S. Paul did not command expressely, that all should be married, as some might collect from his words, vers. 2. Junius ap-

[c] *Dum tribuit veniam, denotat culpam.*

[d] *Quis ambiget, absurdissimè dici, non eos peccâsse, quibus venia datur?*

[e] *Quis esse peccatum neget, cùm dari veniam facientibus Apostolica authoritas fateatur?*

[f] *Liberum interim faciens hac in re suum cuique judicium.*

[g] *Non dico ut in decreto decisivo.*

[h] *Quod dico ex consensu posse alterum ab altero discedere ad tempus propter jejunium & orationem; non jubeo sed consulo. Nam nè Deus quidem ipse hoc ordinarium aut perpetuum esse mandavit suis, sed exemplum præbuit cum hoc consilio meo ἀνάλογον, &c.*

[i] *Dico hoc, juris (ut dici solet) consilium; non ut mandatum.*

applieth them to his leaving it indifferent for man and wife to forſake the companie of each other for a time. [i] *Auguſtines* PARDON *is farre fetcht and forced too much*, ſaith Beza: for συγγνώμη is a candid interpretation upon good reaſon, and doth not alwaies imply ſuch a pardon as connoteth a fault. Ariſtotle ſaith, [k] *It is an upright ſentence, inclining not to rigour, but to moderation.* Peter Martyr ſaith, [l] *It is exerciſed about that which is equall, and qualifieth the rigour of the law, which otherwiſe is extream injurie. Even in the ſame ſort could I deal with one whom I ſaw to faſt, or to ſtudie too much; that he might ſometime refreſh himſelf. Which I would not ſay imperiouſly, but by way of counſel grounded on equitie. Neither doth it therefore follow, that to ſtudie hard, or to faſt holily is a ſinne.* So farre Peter Martyr; who might as well have inſiſted in S. Pauls advice to his ſcholar, 1. Tim. 5. 23. *Drink no longer water, but uſe a little wine for thy ſtomacks ſake, and thine often infirmities.* The Syriack in Junius hath it anſwerable to the Arabick; [m] *This I ſay, as to the weak; not by commandment.* [n] *By grant, not precept*, as Tremellius turneth it. [o] *I charge not, but permit*, ſaith Haymo: for how could S. Paul command when Chriſt left it free? When Chriſt ſaid, *It is not given to all:* or, *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it*, Matth. 19. 12. if the words have reference to the ſecond verſe: or, when God himſelf left it indifferent, if it hath dependance upon the temporarie abſtemiouſneſſe, upon juſt occaſion touched at in the fifth verſe?

Concerning the ſecond objection, verſ. 10. *Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord.* I anſwer, Firſt, that thoſe forms of ſpeech are not ſimply *excluſive*, much leſſe *contradictorie*; and denote not ſo much a ſimple *negation* as a kinde of *compariſon* ſometime: *I, yet not I.* And we have other places of Scripture to be ranked in the ſame parallell: John 7. 16. *My doctrine is not mine, but his that ſent me.* As therefore it was moſt true, that Chriſts doctrine, even as he is God and Man, is not his in one ſenſe, that is, *originally*; (for as he had not the divine eſſence of himſelf, or from himſelf, but from God the Father; ſo from the Father had he the divine doctrine) and yet in another ſenſe is truely Chriſts doctrine; as conceived and preached by him who is God, the Fountain of truth, yea Truth it ſelf. And as the doctrine which he had as he was Man, was partly not his, (for the infuſed doctrine into the ſoul of Chriſt, comprehending all ſcientificall habits, by which Chriſt naturally knew, and that moſt perfectly, whatſoever was to be known, was not his as Man, but was infuſed of God) and partly his, namely ſuch as he, like a Viator or another Man, experimentally might gather. And the true meaning of the words may be, *The doctrine which I preach is not the invention of mine own brain, but his rather*

who

[i] *Nomen* VENIÆ *perperam torquetur ab Auguſtino.*

[k] Ἡ συγγνώμη, γνώμη ἐστὶ κριτικὴ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς ὀρθή. Eth. l. 6. c. 11

[l] *Verſatur circa æquè, & ſummum jus remittit, quod alioquin eſt ſumma injuria.*

[m] *Hoc dico ego, tanquàm infirmis, non ex mandato.*

[n] *Ex conceſſione, non ex imperio.*

[o] *Non præcipio, ſed permitto.*

nolo sentire me, to teach you what he taught me: and so is both mine, and not mine. To which effect Peterius. So in the place of the Apostle where it is written, *I command, yet not I, but the Lord*, since S. Paul might be considered either as an ordinarie man, or as an Apostle inspired from God: he first saith, *I command*, and then by distinguishing explaineth his meaning, *Yet not I*, as a common man, *but rather the Lord*, by me his Apostle. And all this proveth not that S. Paul could write any thing as he was an Apostle, of his own head, or yet put in any of his own conceits: but was wholly guided by the Spirit. For, whatsoever is so properly mans work, that it is not also Gods, that is not good; since the Author of goodnesse is excluded.

Secondly I answer, The place doth rather expressely say, that whatsoever S. Paul wrote or spake as an Apostle, they were not his words or writings, but the words of God (for his commands were not his, but the Lords) then any way imply that he could write any thing as an Apostle, without the Spirit, or by the dictate of his own naturall prudence onely.

Thirdly, [a] *I command not according to mine opinion, but the Lord in the Gospel doth, That a man may not depart from his wife except for fornication*, saith Haymo. Where our Saviour speaks not of a short departure with consent, for the improvement of religious duties (for then S. Paul might have had a command for it in the objection precedent:) but our Saviour speaketh of a totall or finall departure of man and wife by bill of divorcement or separation: for of this Christ spake expressely, Mat. 19.9. Mark 10.11. Luk. 16.18. Therefore S. Paul commanded not, but the Lord; namely Christ in those places of the Gospel to which he aimed.

[a] *Præcipio non ego ex mea sententia, sed Dominus in Evangelio, &c.*

The third objection is out of the 1. Cor. 7. 12. *To the rest speak I, not the Lord.* These words compared with the former may seem to carrie it cleare against me. For what can be of more force? *I command, yet not I, but the Lord*; and, *To the rest speak I, not the Lord*: as if S. Paul spake and wrote something by humane wisdome, which the Lord bid him not. First, I answer with Peter Martyr, S. Paul saith thus, because before he had reference to Christs speech in the Gospel, of not easily dissolving matrimonie: but now he sets down somewhat, of which Christ in the Gospel is not found to have said any thing. So now *he* speaks, not *the Lord*: namely, not *Christ in the Gospel*, not *Christ by word of mouth as he was man*: and yet on the contrarie side, we may as truely say even in this place, and to S. Pauls proper sense, with the words inverted, *The Lord speaks, not I.* Not I, of my self, not I, as a man: but God from heaven, or the holy Spirit speaketh.

The conclusion is, S. Paul speaketh or writeth nothing as an Apostle from himself, without the Lord, without divine immediate revelation from the holy Ghost: but he might relate something which Christ spake not whileſt Christ lived on earth; something that is not registred in the Gospel: And thus S. Paul did speak, and not the Lord: And thus may an other speak or write, and not the Lord. p *I speak, not the Lord: Did not the Lord speak by him? Yes. But therefore he said that himself spake and not the Lord, because this precept is not contained in any of the Gospels, as the other was*, saith Haymo before Peter Martyr. And indeed, I remember not that Christ so much as toucheth at this point; Whether a beleeving man should put away, or dwell from an unbeleeving woman, yea or no?

To the fourth objection, 1. Cor. 7. 25. *I have no commandment from the Lord, yet I give my judgement*, I answer, It was matter of *counsel*, not of *precept*; it was left indifferent; the doing, or not doing had not been sinne. q *Christ would give no command concerning single life or virginitie, lest he should seem to condemn marriage.* So Augustine, *in libello de sanct. virginit.* So Hierom against Jovinian: So Ambrose, saith Peter Martyr. Yet the *Consilium do, I counsel*, is the advice of such an one, as *had obtained mercie of the Lord to be faithfull*: and a faithfull steward will not distribute more or lesse then his Lord appointeth.

The unjust steward made them write lesse then was due: the usurer makes them write more: the good and faithfull man followeth his masters will *rem ad rem, foot by foot*. So this place proveth not that the Apostle as an Apostle wrote or spake by humane wisdome any thing, but what was appointed of God.

The Rhemists on verse 12 say, *By this we learn, that there were many matters over and above the things that Christ taught or prescribed, left to the Apostles order and interpretation: wherein they might, as the case required, either command or counsel, and we bound to obey accordingly.* Doctour Estius goeth further: r *This speech,* I COMMAND, YET NOT I, BUT THE LORD, *doth sufficiently evidence, that the Apostles and their successours can command something which Christ himself by himself commanded not.* Both of them runne awry in one extream. Doctour Fulk answereth to that place of the Rhemists; *The Apostles had not particular precepts for every case; but they had generall rules in Christs doctrine, which they were bound to follow in their precepts and counsels.* I think he approacheth too nigh unto them; unlesse he mean that both their precepts and counsels had the divine dictate to guide them; especially in things which they wrote. And whereas he saith, *They had not particular precepts*

for

p *Ego dico, non Dominus: Nunquid Dominus non loquebatur per eum? Utique. Sed ideo dixit se dicere, & non Dominum; quia hoc præceptum non continetur in Evangelio dicto à Domino sicut illud superius.*

q *Noluit Deus de virginitate & cælibatu præcipere, quia visus fuisset damnare nuptias*

r *Satis autem insinuat hic sermo,* Præcipio non ego, sed Dominus, *Apostolos & eorum successores posse quædã præcipere quæ Christus ipse per se non præcepit.*

for every case, I say, they had for all cases necessarie: especially concerning the whole Church. And their generall rules might rather be for guiding matters of *order* and *discipline*, then of *doctrine*. For he that promised to lead them into all truth, would not leave them in the framing of particulars, as he doth us and other men, who out of generals do deduce these and these specials. For there is a great distance and traverse to be placed between those sacred Penmen, and other succeeding Expositours of holy Writ. And S. Paul doth imply, that even his judgement or counsel was according to the Spirit of God; as Bishop Andrews well observed, and now cometh to be handled.

The fifth objection is verse 40. in the same verse where he saith, *Κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην, According to my judgement*, he addeth, *δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν, I think also that I have the Spirit of God. Minus dicit, plus volens intelligi, He speaketh sparingly, but would be understood more largely*, say I. So verse 26, *I suppose*: and 1. Cor. 4. 9. *I think that God hath set forth us the Apostles last.* I THINK. *He speaketh soberly, signifying more then he spake, and it is all one as if he had said*, I KNOW CERTAINLY, saith Dionysius Carthus. with whom accordeth Primasius, *Do not think that I speak what I do of my self, the Spirit of God speaketh in me:* The word I THINK *is not wrapped about with doubtfulnesse.* Peter Martyr thinks it is an Ironie against the false Apostles, who traduced S. Paul as unworthy to be an Apostle. And then the Ironie hath as full force, as if he had peremptorily avouched, *The Spirit of the Lord is in me, and by it I write what I write.*

Other objections may be made, as the 2. Cor. 11. 17. *I speak it not after the Lord, but as it were foolishly in this confidence of boasting.* Therefore not onely humane wisdome, but humane infirmitie may seem to challenge part both in his words and writings. It is answered in a few words of Dionysius Carthusianus, *Non loquor, id est, Loqui non videor*: that is, *It seems not so to some, though my self know the contrarie.*

Others may object, 1. Cor. 9. 8. *Say I these things as a man? or saith not the Law the same also?* I answer, that he might speak or write some things like an other man, some things unexpressed in their Law; but now he speaketh or writeth (for they are both one sense in this notion) as an Apostle; who therefore was equally to be regarded (as a Penman of the *Law of Grace*) with Moses, a Penman of the *Law Levitical*.

It may yet be objected what S. John saith, 2. Epist. vers. 12. *Having many things to write unto you, I would not write with paper and ink:* and 3. Epist. John ver. 13. *I had many things to write, but I will not with ink and pen write unto thee.* From whence a power seemeth to be wholly left in him, both whether he would

f Puto autem. *Sobriè loquitur, minúsque dicit & majus significat; ut sit sensus*, Certò scio.

g Puto *non dubitationem significat.*

would write of no; and what he would write, I answer to both places; If he had said he had writ any thing without or beyond the Spirit, or what he was bid not to write, he had spoken home to the purpose: but these words do not imply that he had either power or will to write any thing of his own head, or by the wisdome or learning of man; but they fully evidence, that the holy Ghost had suggested many things unto him, which the same blessed Spirit would not have him to write, as being fitter perhaps to be delivered face to face, and not concerning posterities.

If I knew any more opposite arguments, I would endeavour their answer. The positive proofs I referre to the last point of all; it being the very main hinge of the controversie. Onely consider this one thing, *The Scripture hath a priviledge above all other writings*. Aquinas on 2. Timoth. 3. 15. giveth this reason, * *Because other writings savour of humane reason, but the Scripture is divine*: Where he excludeth the prudence of man from composing any Scripture. If any earthly wisdome wrote any part of it, it is no more to be accounted our Scripture. Let this suffice for the third conclusion, concerning the matter of Scripture: wherein the holy Penmen had no libertie left them to put in their own conceits, or in writing to adde or blot out what they had done: whereby all humane literature and wisdome is removed from sharing part in the holy Writ.

The fourth conclusion followeth, concerning the manner of writing: *viz.* They had no libertie to clothe their inward apprehensions with words of their own. Either all the Penmen had the libertie, or none: (The disjunction stands upon a *Da tertium, Give me a reason why some should, and not others.* Who were these some? and why those?) But all had not libertie: (for the very words were dictated unto some of them) *Ergò &c.*

Either every Penman did apparell his understanding with words of his own throughout all and every of his own writings, or it was practised in some places onely. If so, then again I enquire what places they were; and why those had an especiall priviledge above others.

S. John indeed was bid to *write the things which he had seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter*, Revel. 1. 19. I answer, This generall command evinceth not, that the holy Ghost did not administer as well the words as the matter.

If it be objected, that the Evangelicall Propher Isaiah, and the Psalmograph, and some others, are most eloquent in the Old, and in the New Testament, the beloved disciple S. John is compared to an Eagle for his lofty flight; and S. Paul may seem to have brought some of the third heaven down with him,

* *Quia aliæ traditæ sunt per rationem humanam; sacra autem Scriptura est divina.*

him; ſo heavenly is he: but Amos, and ſome others writ more plainly, in an homely ſtyle. I anſwer, If all this were true, yet it proveth not that any of them were left to expreſſe as they would their own dreams, viſions, or illuminations; neither did they frame and fit their ſtyles to the Spirit, or their words to the matter; nor indeed could they. For what proportion is there between *finite* and *infinite?* and how can the ſhallow capacitie of *man* comprehend the depth of *God?* God forbad the linſie-woolſie; and to the *divine truths* would he ſuffer them to adapt *humane expreſsions?* How often in the Old Teſtament, is both the matter put into their hearts, and the manner with the words into their mouthes? And is the Law of Grace of leſſe worth then the Law of Moſes? God forbid. But whoſoever readeth the Prophet Amos, and the reſt that are undervalued, ſhall finde more in Amos, then Amos; more in him then in one *among the herd-men of Tekoa*, Amos 1.1. and ſhall heare the piercing language of the Spirit in others; ſometimes perhaps attempering it ſelf to the partie writing, and making both words and matter eaſie, but at other times it rapteth him above himſelf, and maketh him (as it were) to prink it in loftie and almoſt undiſcernable towring; by infuſing things, phraſing ſentences, and dictating words above what was agreeable to the meanneſſe of his former calling.

That the holy Ghoſt can and hath ſuggeſted the very words very often, I think none will denie. That ever he permitted them a libertie of many ſentences, of many phraſes, of many variations of words, to chooſe what they liked, and to refuſe the reſt; I think few ancient Divines ever ſaid before, but to that effect ſaith Heinſius. Els what can his meaning be, when he ſaith, S. John ſaw the Chaldee Paraphraſe, and Helleniſts, and had often reference to them; and that divers things were taken from the Targummim? [a] *The Evangeliſt alwayes hath an eye to the Targumiſts*, ſaith he, pag. 550. If the noble Heinſius had ſaid in any one place (which he did not, ſo farre as my remembrance now beareth) that the holy Spirit had guided S. John to thoſe Authours and authorities of the Targumiſts, Helleniſts, and Chaldee Paraphraſt; I ſhould have ſubſcribed, and ſat down at his feet. But when he ſo often appealeth from the Greek to the Syriack, and ſaith, S. John was ſo converſant with the forenamed Authours; he derogateth (in mine opinion) from the majeſtie of the holy Writ; whileſt he would ſeem to have ought of it taken from humane reading or wiſdome, though of an Apoſtle; unleſſe it were added, That the holy Spirit guided the Apoſtle unto it, and did dictate it unto him, not as it was known before to the Apoſtle, but as the holy Ghoſt thought fit to make uſe of it, and to ſanctifie that part of humane literature: to dictate, I ſay,

[a] *Ad Targumiſtas ſemper reſpicit Evangeliſta.*

say, the words and syllables, yea every letter and iota, and in the writing to guide their hands aright, as a good master of writing over-spreadeth and over-ruleth the hand of his scholar, and writeth what copie he pleaseth, without reference or regard to the scholars former knowledge, but rather to his future instruction.

This is that which against Heinsius may be averred, That though many things which are in S. John and other holy Penmen, were before in the Targum, Talmud, Hellenists, Chaldee Paraphrase, or any heathen Authours, yet it doth not necessarily evince, that the holy Actuaries or Notaries did oversee, reade, heare, or transcribe those things out of their knowledge from the said Authours: but both the names of those Authours, and the things themselves were presenced to them by that blessed Spirit which knew all things, and this among the rest, That these words, phrases, and sentences, were fit to be inserted into the holy Writ, which now are in it.

All Scripture is of divine inspiration: But the very words are part of Scripture: Therefore even they were inspired.

Revel. 19. 9. The Angel said, *Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage-supper of the Lambe.* Did not the Angel speak the words? Did not he give the Apostle both matter and words?

When the Apostle was commanded, Revel. 14. 13. by a voice from heaven, to write, *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, &c.* was he commanded to write his conceits and thoughts apprehended in Syriack, and translate them into Hellenisticall Greek? or did the heavenly voice suggest onely an holy inspiration into him, and left him to coyn words, as Heinsius would have it? or rather did not the voice teach the very words which should be written, viz. *Blessed are the dead, &c.?* Now let us passe to the fifth and last Conclusion, in which we must dissent from the worthy Heinsius, and disarm him of his often-inculcated, but not once proved Tenet,

The Ἀυτογραφοι, or *Writers of holy Scripture, conceived in one language, and writ in an other.* Upon which ground he hath raised a strange structure: but his very ground-work is sandie, slipperie, and false: And this I hope to evince by Scripture, Authoritie, and Reason. All which shall be squared to that Corner-stone, which more then once before I hewed upon more roughly, and now (by Gods grace) intend to polish, namely, That the very words and letters were dictated unto the holy Scribes: and therefore they had no power to change or transchange, to adde or diminish, or to expresse by their own words their internall irradiation: but in the language which

which they conceived, they also wrote their heavenly dictates.

2. Pet. 1. 21. *The Prophesie came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the holy Ghost.* Therefore their very speech being according to the motion of the holy Ghost, their words were not of their own choice, but from above; and not onely divine thoughts, but sacred words were also given them.

1. Cor. 2. 13. S. Paul spake *in words which the holy Ghost taught.* Did the holy Ghost inspire thoughts into them in one language, and teach them words to speak in an other language? *Cui bono?* To what end and purpose? and why not all done in the language which they conceived?

2. Tim. 3. 16. *Scriptura per Spiritum scripta est, The Scripture was writ by the Spirit,* saith the Syriack; not onely *inspired,* as it is from the Greek; but *written,* and as it was inspired, written.

Revel. 19. 9. The Angel saith concerning very words which he commanded to be wrote, *These are the true sayings of God.* Not *inspirations* onely of *God,* and the *words* of *Men;* but *the sayings of God.*

Exod. 34. 27. *Write thou these words: for after the tenour of these words I have made a covenant.* God was not tied to the words, Moses was to the writing of the very words.

Jerem. 30. 2. *Write thee all the words which I have spoken unto thee in a book.* He gave him no power to put in words of his own.

Twelve times in the Revelation was S. John commanded *to write:* and knew he not *the words?*

Hos. 8. 12. *I have written to Ephraim the great things of my Law;* Even all what my Prophets have done, I challenge as mine own writing.

Authorities of men.

The Scriptures were written [y] *in obedience to the Spirit,* saith Sasbout on Peter: Therefore the Apostles had not the power left unto them of writing their own conceits, but were fitted with words by the Spirit.

[z] *If the Prophets and other writers of holy Scripture spake by the moving and inspiration of the holy Ghost; it followeth, that all the Scripture is the word of God; no otherwise to be esteemed of by us, then if God immediately without the ministery of men or Angels had set it forth, and, as I may say, had written it with his own finger,* saith the learned Estius.

Even Cornelius Cornelii à Lapide himself, on Timothie thus, [a] *The Prophets and other holy Penmen of Scripture are styled the pens and instruments of the holy Ghost, as of that scribe who speedily writeth, inspireth, and dictateth the divine writ.* Where he

[y] *Magisterio Spiritus.*

[z] *Si Spiritu sancto inspirati, & ab eo impulsi, locuti sunt Propheta; & cæteri librorum sacrorum scriptores, Consequens est, Scripturam totam esse verbum Dei; non aliter à nobis accipiendam, quàm si Deus immediatè & absque humano vel Angelico ministerio eam edidisset, &, ut ità dicam, digito suo scripsisset.*

[a] *Prophetæ, & alii scriptores sacri γραφεῖς, vocantur calami & instrumenta Spiritus sancti, quasi scribæ velociter scribentis, inspirantis, & dictantis sacras literas.*

he confesseth the holy Spirit not to inspire onely, but to dictate, yea, to write like a swift scribe the holy Scripture.

Gregorius, *Præfat. in Job cap. 2.* *The writers of the heavenly word, because they are filled with the holy Ghost, are elevated above themselves in him; and, as it were, out of themselves: and so the sentences of God are uttered, as it were, by their lips.*

Athanasius, *Epist. ad Lib.* saith, *Christ made the old and New Testament.*

What is the mouth of the Lord, but the Scriptures, by which the Lord speaketh? saith Rupert on Matth. *lib.* 4.

Philo Judæus, *in lib. Quis rerum divinarum hæres* thus, *A Prophet propheseth nothing out of his own brain; but all things by the prompting of the holy Ghost:* as he wittily concludeth. Therefore not so much as the words are his own.

Chrysostom, *de Lazaro, Homil.* 4. *Though a dead man revive, and an Angel come from heaven, you must beleeve Scriptures above all: for the Master of Angels, the Lord of the living and the dead, he himself framed them.* The same Chrysostom, *de expulsione ipsius*, sheweth the manner. *I reade his own handwriting, &c.* They are done by his hand; the very writing it self is his: and therefore called *Chyrographum Dei, A writing under Gods own hand*, by Augustine, on Psal. 144.

Now follow the Reasons why they conceived and writ in the same tongue.

First, there is little or no difference between the Apostles and other men, if the Apostles did frame words to their heavenly inspirations. For when it pleaseth the blessed Spirit, who bloweth where he listeth, to drop down into the soul of an ordinary man some thoughts divine, and in the language of spirits saith unto the same soul, Of these see that you make a prayer; the righteous man accordingly obeyeth, and of those inward apprehensions shapeth a verbal prayer, and poureth it forth before God Almightie, and setteth it down in writing: Shall the prayer be held as Divine as Scriptures? Then may Manasses his Apocryphall prayer, immediately before the books of Maccabees (as it is in our last translation) be no longer Apocryphall, but Divine; as Divine as any prayer made by the selected holy Penmen. To have a thing perfectly Divine, is required that heavenly words may be mixed with heavenly illumination.

Secondly, our faith will be questioned, if thoughts were inspired, and the Penmen should adde what words they pleased. [f] *Our faith will stumble, if the authoritie of the Scripture be shaken never so little*, saith Augustine, *de doctr. Christian.* 1. 37. But the Scriptures authoritie shaketh, if God give onely the matter, and men the words.

Thirdly, the Prophets and Apostles wrote not alwayes all their

[b] *Scriptores sacri Eloquii, quia repleti Spiritu sancto, super se trahuntur, quasi extra semetipsos fiunt; & sic Dei sententiæ, quasi de labiis, proferunt.*

[c] *Christus vetus & novum Testamentum composuit.*

[d] *Quid est illud os Domini, nisi Scriptura, per quas loquitur Dominus?*

[e] *Propheta nihil ex se proloquitur, sed omnia, submonente alio.*

[f] *Titubabit fides, si Scripturarum vacillat authoritas.*

their own things themſelves; but ſometimes uſed the miniſterie of divers others. A Scribe and a Prophet were two diſtinct perſons and offices, Jer. 36. 26.

Jeremie had Baruch: Jer. 36. 4. *Baruch wrote from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the Lord:* ſo then the words of Jeremiah to Baruch, were the words of the Lord to Jeremiah: And when that roll was burnt, Jeremiah by the word of the Lord, was bid *to take another roll, and write in it*, verſ. 28, &c. Which Jeremie did, not by himſelf, but by *Baruch the ſcribe*, verſ. 32.

The nine firſt chapters of the Proverbs of Solomon were written by Solomon himſelf. The reſt were writ by others; who attended on Solomon and heard them: and are like ſo many precious ſtones apart, and ſeverally; though not made up into one jewell or chain, nor hanging together in any ſetled method; yet to be eſteemed at as high a rate and value as the very writings of Solomon. The ſame Spirit inſpired all, the ſame mouth ſpake all, though they were penned by ſeverall hands, by the command of the ſame holy Spirit.

In the New Teſtament S. Paul wrote much *with his own hand*; The whole Epiſtle to the Galatians, Gal. 6. 11. (at leaſt to theſe very words:) and to Philemon, verſ. 19.

Many ſalutations: 2. Theſſal. 3. 17, 18. *The ſalutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epiſtle: ſo I write, The grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt be with you all. Amen.* So that we may ſoundly gather, that whatſoever Epiſtle under his name hath not that in it, it was not written by him. There was an Epiſtle written in his name to the Theſſalonians, terrifying them as if the generall judgement had been preſent: as may be gathered, 2. Theſſ. 2. 2. But S. Paul diſclaims it. It had not (belike) the ſalutation with his own hand, his friendly farewell and prayer, which (ſaith Anſelm) was in theſe or the like words, *Grace, &c.* as all the reſt of his Epiſtles have toward their end, though with a little variation of words; ſometimes larger, ſometimes briefer: even the Epiſtle to the Hebrews alſo, Hebr. 13. 25. *Grace be with you all. Amen.* That you may not queſtion, but alſo that is his Epiſtle: whereas no other Apoſtles have it ſo fully; though S. Peter cometh neareſt him, 1. Pet. 5. 14.

For all this, he uſed the help of ſome others in writing: *All the ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians was written with another hand, except the ſalutation at the end*, ſaith Eſtius. Rom. 16. 22. *I Tertius, who wrote this Epiſtle, ſalute you in the Lord.* The words will bear this ſenſe, *I Tertius, who wrote this Epiſtle in the Lord, ſalute you*: or thus, (as the Vulgat hath it) *I Tertius ſalute you, who wrote this Epiſtle in the Lord. He ſaid*, IN THE LORD, *to ſhew that he wrote not for money*, ſaith Cajetan:

Queſtionleſſe, Paul dictated, and Tertius wrote the Epiſtle, ſaith Eſtius. Even thoſe words themſelves are not Tertius his own, inſerted as a private mans or ſecretaries, but are divine Scripture. And either by the Spirit he was commanded to write ſo, and that thought was from heaven put into his heart, and thoſe words into his mouth, to be written by his hand: or elſe (which I take to be moſt likely) S. Paul knowing the minde of Tertius, perhaps in part by Tertius his own expreſſion, but rather and chiefeſt by Divine revelation, that Tertius did ſalute them in the Lord; he willed him ſo to write.

I hope Heinſius will not ſay, that Tertius conceived in Syriack, and wrote in Greek: or, when S. Paul made his narrative in the Hebrew tongue, Act. 22.2. that Luke conceived in Syriack, and wrote in Greek: neither can he ſay the like of the holy ſecretaries, to whom not firſt thoughts in language ſpirituall, and then words, but thoughts by words outward and expreſſed were revealed. Yet Eraſmus in his laſt Annotation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, ſaith thus, [g] *What ſome do affirm*, THAT S. PAUL HIMSELF VVROTE IN HEBREVV, BUT S. LUKE DID EXPRESSE IN HIS OVVN VVORDS THE ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE VVHICH HE HAD GOTTEN BY HEART, *let others conſider what force and power it hath.* What, will you ſay nothing to this? Not ſo great a Critick? Sure this drop might have fallen from your pen, That ſuch manner of writing had favoured no more of the Spirit, then any ordinary writing where a skilfull ſcribe doth amplifie the heads given unto him.

Again, Eraſmus on Hebr. 2. in his Anſwer to Fabers 57 objection, relateth that Faber, [h] *Whatſoever ſeems incommodious or offenſive, layeth the fault thereof upon the Interpreters: but not prudently enough, as I think*, ſaith Eraſmus: and in the anſwer to the one and fourtieth objection, [i] *Faber ſcourgeth the Interpreter of this Epiſtle who did not turn the word ELOHIM, in the Pſalm, FROM GOD, when the Septuagint did ſo, to whom this might rather be imputed.* Again, Eraſmus ſaith, *ibid.* of Faber, [k] *He commenceth a ſuit againſt the Interpreter of this Epiſtle.* All this ſhews Fabers opinion to be, That ſome writers of Scripture had power to uſe ſuch words as they pleaſed: and uſed ſome amiſſe, even ſuch as he found fault withall. O novell criticiſm! Wilt thou ſet thy ſelf no bounds till thou reacheſt up to heaven, and trampleſt on the word of God? The holy *Amanuenſes* were guided by the Spirit to *write*, as well as the Apoſtles to *dictate*.

When S. Paul accounted, and would have his Galatians to account it as a favour above ordinary, that he wrote ſo large an Epiſtle as that to the Galatians with his own hand; and ſince the Epiſtle to the Romanes was larger then it, and

was

[g] *Quod affirmant ibi quidam*, Paulum ipſũ ſcripſiſſe Hebraicè, cæterùm Lucam argumentum Epiſtolæ, quam memoriâ tenebat, ſuis explicuiſſe verbis, *quantum valeat, viderint alii.*

[h] *Quicquid eſt incommodi & offenſiuculi, id in Interpretem rejicit; ſed meo judicio parùm prudenter.*

[i] *Faber flagellat Interpretem hujus Epiſtolæ, qui in Pſalmo non verterit* ELOHIM, *A DEO, cùm idem fecerint Septuaginta, quibus magis conveniebat hoc imputari.*

[k] *In ſus trahit Interpretem Epiſtolæ.*

was writ by Tertius, let me probably collect, that other Epistles of S. Paul, as those to the Corinthians, and that to the Hebrews, and any other (if any other be longer and larger) were not written by S. Pauls own hand. For then his own writing had not been so great a testimonie and argument of his love to the Galatians, for the rest were longer and larger, but were writ by some other hand, except perhaps the close and salutation.

Fevardentius, on 1. Pet. 5. 12. and Salmeron, *Tom. 13. Disput. 5.* (as they are cited by Lorinus, Act. 15. 23.) do think that Paul and the rest of the Apostles wrote seldome with their own hands, but did dictate and subscribe: which they prove by S. Peter, 1. Pet. 5. 12. *By Silvanus a faithfull brother unto you (as I suppose) I have written briefly.* Lorinus answereth, That by the same reason Judas and Silas wrote the Epistle of the Councel at Hierusalem, Act. 15. 23. Let me reply, That I see nothing to the contrary in the Text, or otherwhere, but Judas and Silas being *chief men among the brethren*, might write it as well as any others; and might also be joyned in Commission with others to carrie it.

Concerning which Penmen this is my opinion: *That even they were led by the holy Ghost both to conceive what the Apostles spake, and so write exactly what they dictated: so that they did not, they could not erre in writing any one word, syllable, or letter of the first Originals; no nor did, nor could mis-accent it, or mis-point any part thereof: nor can it be proved, nor seemeth likely that ever the Apostles revised, or righted what the Penmen had done; but subscribed to it, took it as their own, or rather as the holy Ghosts, and sealed it for divine Scripture.* Oh that the first Originals themselves of the New Testament, or of some part of it, could yet be found! I would go a thousand miles on my bare feet to see them, kisse them, and in Tertullians phrase, I would *adore the plenitude of them*. They would prove an Antidote against many heresies, a corrective of more false opinions which have sprung up from the variation of Copies, and the uncertaintie what reading is best.

By this opinion, I am sure, one firm anchor-hold is established; That humane wisdome and skill is excluded from having part in any parcell of Scripture: and the whole Scripture is by me maintained to be wholly and absolutely true, certain, and most divine; which Hemsius and others seem not to do. So end I this point.

I Give thee thanks, most gracious God, that thou hast freed me of the gout, and eased me of the stone: that I have been able, though in great weakness, to swim through this sea, to go through this wilderness in paths unrouted. Lord, I beseech thee, by thine infinite mercies, be mercifull to my sinfull progresse through for my departure, and in the hour of death and judgement, good Christ deliver me. Amen.

CHAP. X.

1. *Reall truth in the Greek and Latine texts of Act. 7. 16. The place expounded thus.* The Fathers were not Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but the twelve sonnes of Jacob.

2. *These twelve Fathers were not buried in* Abrahamio, *but in* Sychem.

3. Abraham *in this place is not taken* properly, *but* patronymice.

4. Τὸ ἔκρινε, *used by S. Stephen, amphibolous, and expounded.*

5. *Two opinions concerning the place of Act. 7. 16. propounded.*

6. *The last preferred.*

NOw return to the old matter and Text, Act. 7. 16. Foure propositions there are in the words of S. Stephen, which are all questioned. First, that the Fathers are said to be carried over into Sychem.

Secondly, that they were laid in the sepulchre of Abraham.

Thirdly, that Abraham bought the sepulchre of the sonnes of Hemor.

Fourthly, that this Hemor was the father of Sychem, as our last Translation hath it very truely.

Now let us see what different or contrary propositions are maintained against these; and so labour to reconcile them.

First, that the Fathers were not carried over into Sychem.

Secondly, that they were not laid in the sepulchre of Abraham.

Third-

Thirdly, that Abraham bought the field of *Ephron the ſonne of Zohar*, Gen. 23. 8.

Fourthly, that Hemor was the ſonne of Sychem, as the Vulgat and Genevean tranſlations have it.

That the firſt propoſition may be reconciled to his oppoſite, let us examine what is meant by the word *Fathers*. All the Patriarchs indeed were Fathers, and ſo called: *Abraham is our Father*, ſay the Jews, Joh. 8. 39. and, *Art thou greater then our Father Jacob?* ſaith the woman to Chriſt, Joh. 4. 12. *I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob*, ſaith God himſelf, or an Angel repreſenting him, Act. 7. 32. *Abraham was a great Father*, Eccluſ. 44. 19. Theſe Patriarchs were *Patres majorum gentium*, *Fathers of the higheſt rank*: if I may accommodate the Romane diſtinction unto the Jewiſh Governours. And whereas David is called, Act. 2. 29. according both to the Greek and Latine, *a Patriarch*; there by the Arabick Tranſlatour he is termed *Princeps Patrum*, *The chief* or *Prince of the Fathers*. Yet in the ſenſe of S. Stephen, by the word *Fathers*, thoſe firſt or greateſt Fathers, and prime Patriarchs are not to be underſtood: but the *Patres minorum gentium*, *Fathers of a lower degree*; onely Joſeph and the other ſonnes of Jacob, the immediate Fathers and Heads of the twelve Tribes. And this is apparent by the light of the words themſelves; where there is a wall of ſeparation between the one and the other, Act. 7. 15. *Jacob died, he and our Fathers*: therefore there were ſome who were called Fathers, after Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob. *Jacob died, he and our Fathers*: Not Abraham and Iſaac; for they died before Jacob: but *Jacob died*; and who els? *He, and our Fathers*: What more? *He, and our Fathers* (when they were dead) *were carried to Sychem*. But Abraham and Iſaac were never carried to Sychem. Again, ſuch Fathers are meant as died in Egypt; (for they that died in Canaan needed no carrying over to the place where they were) and *Jacob went down into Egypt, and died* there, *he, and our Fathers*. But Abraham, though he went down into Egypt, yet died not there; but he *went up out of Egypt, he, and his wife, and all that he had*, Geneſ. 13. 1. leſt you might think, that he by leaving ought behinde might be occaſioned to return into Egypt. And Iſaac was never in Egypt; therefore could not die there. Jacob died, and his bones were removed to the ſame ſepulchre where his father and grandfather lay; which was not in Sychem, but in Hebron: Therefore the word *Fathers* cannot be fitted in this place to Abraham, Iſaac, or Jacob; but to the twelve Patriarchs (as S. Stephen calleth them) the ſonnes of Jacob. For both Abraham and Sarah, Iſaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Leah, were buried *in the cave that is in the field of Machpelah* by Hebron, Gen. 49. 31.

but Joseph his bones were buried in Sychem, Josh. 24. 32. Lastly, the rest of the Fathers the brethren of Joseph were buried in Sychem, as well as Joseph: for S. Hierom proveth it by their sepulchres extant at Sychem, and visited, as their sepulchres, in his dayes; who is to be beleeved, and was an *eye-witnesse*, saith Beza: So that the first-seeming contradiction is salved up: Joseph and his brethren, the twelve Patriarchs, were those Fathers which died after Jacob; and were translated into Sychem, and there buried: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were not those Fathers: for onely one of them died in Egypt, and all three were buried by Hebron, and needed not to be, nor were translated to Sychem.

2. The semblance of the second opposite proposition, inforceth me to handle this point, Whether the brethren of Joseph, the twelve Patriarchs, were buried in the sepulchre of Abraham at Hebron, which he bought, and where himself was buried. Josephus, *Antiq.* 2. 8. saith, *All the sonnes of Jacob were buried in Hebron, except Joseph, who was buried in Sychem.* Yea the words of S. Stephen are very punctuall, That the Fathers were laid in the sepulchre which Abraham bought. On the contrary, we proved before, that the sonnes of Jacob were buried in Sychem. Some do answer, *Positi sunt in sepulchro, They were laid in the grave*, is to be referred to Jacob onely; and that the Scripture useth the plurall number sometimes, when in exactnesse it belongeth to one onely; *positi* for *positus, more buried*, for *one buried*. But this is forced, and the great difficultie remaineth, concerning the names of them that sold the ground.

The maker of the School-historie, Carthusian, and Gagneius, say, *The twelve Patriarchs dying in Egypt, were buried in Sychem, and then translated to Hebron; and the monuments of their sepulchres might be in both places.* And so all may be true, what S. Stephen, Josephus, and Hierom say. Of this translation of their bodies (which I approve not) more hereafter.

3. The true way of answering even to this point, will be found in the attoning of the third different proposition. *Abraham bought the sepulchre of the sonnes of Hemor*, saith S. Stephen: *Abraham bought the sepulchre of Ephron the sonne of Zohar*, saith Moses, Gen. 23. 8. &c. Some say the ground was twice bought, once by Abraham, once by Jacob: others say, the ground and the men had each of them severall names, and that Ephron was called Hemor. Others say, with some likelihood, that the father of Ephron, of whom Abraham bought the ground and the cave, had two names, the one was *Zohar*, Genes. 23. 8. the other *Hemor*, and so called by S. Stephen. Neither can I say ought against these expositions, save this, That I see nothing to prove them but conjecture.

But

But others, who no way can digeſt that the twelve Patriarchs were buried in Sychem, and thence tranſlated to Hebron, but ſay that their bones, bodies, and ſepulchres remained at Sychem, are driven to flie unto this ſtrong hold, That Abraham bought not the ſepulchre of the ſonnes of Hemor, nor did S. Stephen mean ſo; but ⸗ *Abraham*, is taken *patronymicè*: for the fathers name is often uſed for the childe or children, as Iſrael, Edom, Moab, for their off-ſpring. So Geneſ. 11.12. *Arphaxad begat Salah*: Where Arphaxad is ſet for his ſonne: for Arphaxad begat Cainan, and Cainan begat Salah, Luk. 3.36. Likewiſe, 1. King. 12.16. *What portion have we in David?* (ſay the revolting Iſraelites) *neither have we inheritance in the ſonne of Jeſſe; to your tents, O Iſrael: now ſee to thine own houſe, David.* By *Iſrael* he meaneth the people of Iſrael: or his *deſcendants* after many generations are called *himſelfe*, by the name of *Iſrael*. By *David* and *the ſonne of Jeſſe*, you muſt not underſtand the perſon of *David* himſelf, or *Solomon* his ſonne, but Jeſſe his great grand-childe, David his grand-childe, the ſonne of Solomon; *Rehoboam*; exactly parallelling our inſtance. Again, Abraham is ſaid to be *Levi his father*, Heb. 7. 10, but Jacob was Levi his immediate father: ſo even there *Abraham* in ſome ſore ſupplieth the room of *Jacob*, and *Abraham* is taken for *Jacob*. Yea, I may boldly and truely proceed yet further, and ſay, that David is called *the father of Ezekiah*, Iſa. 38. 5. though there were twelve generations from David to him: and David is called *the ſonne of Abraham*, Matth. 1.1. though there were *fourteen generations from Abraham to David*, Matth. 1.17. If predeceſſours ſo many deſcents removed be called Fathers; the grand-childe may be called by the grand-fathers name. The ſumme is, *Abraham* is not here the proper name of the Father of the faithfull, but it muſt be expounded of *Jacob* the grand-childe of Abraham. For indeed *Jacob* the grand-childe of Abraham, *bought the ground of the ſonnes of Hemor the father of Sychem*, Joſh. 24.32. To confirm this, that *Abraham* ſhould be more handſomely taken for his ſonnes ſonne *Jacob*, I found it in a margin-note of Druſius, *Prateritor. lib. 5.* thus, *Abraham, hoc eſt, the ſonne of Abraham*: where he makes ⸗ *Abraham* to be the Genitive caſe, and *filius* to be underſtood. So Vatablus doth: and Martinus Cantapetrenſis is expreſſe, that *Abraham* is the Genitive caſe: and Gaſparus Sanctius likes it; who ſaith, that *among the Hebrews the parents names are put in the Obliqui caſes, and in them their ſonnes are underſtood*: at Luke 3.24. τ. Ματθὰτ, τ. Λευὶ, τ. Μελχὶ, τ. Ἰαννὰ. *Which was the ſonne of Matthat, which was the ſonne of Levi, which was the ſonne of Melchi, which was the ſonne of Janna.* This is a witty expoſition, and moſt excellent, if any copie of the Greek had read it τ. Ἀβραὰμ, or any Latine copie had it *filius Abraham*: for *filius Abraham* might

extend, not onely to Iſaac, but to Jacob himſelf, and lower; for, in Scripture phraſe you ſhall finde the woman healed by Chriſt, Luk. 13. 16. called *a daughter of Abraham*: and Chriſt himſelf ſaith to the Jews, Joh. 8. 56. *Your father Abraham rejoyced.* So much for the reconciling of the ſecond and third Propoſitions; all being cleared by taking *Abraham* for a patronymick, for *Jacob.*

4. The fourth differenee is, That in the Latine tranſlations it is read *à filiis Hemor filii Sychem.* But Hemor was *the father of Sychem*, Joſh. 24. 32. as is alſo proved Judg. 9. 28. where Gaal the ſonne of Ebed perſwaded the Sychemites to ſerve thoſe that deſcended from Hamor and Sychem, rather then Abimelech; as Vatablus collecteth. Peter Martyr ſaith, Gaals argument runneth thus, Serve rather thoſe who were ancient lords of this citie, and if we ſerved not them, ſhall we ſerve Abimelech? Where Gaal ſaid, *Who is Abimelech? and who is Sychem?* The Septuagint have it, τις ἐστιν υἱὸς Συχέμ; *Who is the ſonne of Sychem?* But whether there were at this preſent in the reigne of Abimelech one Sychem living, and in high account, deſcended from the ancient Sychem, who was pointed at in theſe words, *Who is Sychem?* or whether any of Sychem his poſteritie (otherwiſe named) are here called *Shechem*, or whether Gaal made this ἀύξησιν, *augmentation*, *Who is Abimelech? yea, Who was Shechem himſelf* (for the word will bear it in the Originall) *that we ſhould ſerve him?* Which way ſoever it be, the place proveth, that Hamor was the father of Shechem: for ſo run the words afterwards in the ſame verſe, *Serve the men of Hamor the father of Shechem.* Again, if the words may be thus tranſlated, *Quis eſt Abimelech, & qua eſt Shechem?* as both the Interlinearie and Tremellius reade it; the ſenſe may be, Abimelech is not ſo great, and the citie of Shechem is not ſo dejected, ſo forgetfull of its old libertie, as to ſerve Abimelech. Our old Biſhops Bibles reade it, *What is Abimelech, and what is Sychem? — Serve ſuch as come of Hemor the father of Sychem:* and in the margin is ſet, Geneſ. 34. 24.

Moreover, Junius in his Arabick tranſlation on the Acts, chap. 7. obſerveth, that τῷ Συχέμ, *Sychem*, is neither in the Arabick, nor Syriack, nor ſome Greek copies: and Beda in his Commentaries cited by Lorinus ſaith, that for *filii Sychem*, it is read in ſome copies, *qui fuit in Sychem*, ὁ ἐν Συχέμ, *who was in*, or *of Sychem*: accordingly Junius in his notes on the Syriack, Act. 7. ſaith thus, *What is read in the Greek*, viz. Τῷ Συχέμ, *may fitly be expounded by an Hebraiſm, and the name of the Prince of that citie may be underſtood, as if he had ſaid, Which he bought of the ſonnes of Hemor the Prince of Sychem.* Beza indeed ſaith, It may be read with the Vulgar, *the ſonnes of Sychem*, becauſe

the

the Greek Ellipsis useth to be so supplied: but it may as well be interpreted, *Pater Sychem*, *The father of Sychem*. You have the like instance, Luke 24. 10. *Maria Jacobi*, *Marie the mother of James*, as the Syriack there expresseth it. Another proof of the like kinde, is Mark 15. 40. So I expound it here; *The father of Hamor*, i. e. *the father of Sychem*. Thus much for the fourth couplet of Propositions, and the knitting up of that seeming opposition in a small accordance. That Hamor or Hamor was the father of Sychem, as above all denial is proved from Josh. 24. 32. though the Greek word used by S. Stephen be amphibolous. And now it is time to leave the severall answers to each particular doubt, and so render the sense of the words together.

5. One of these two wayes is (in my opinion) necessarie to be embraced.

First, that the twelve Patriarchs the sonnes of Jacob were carried out of Egypt into Sychem, and afterwards out of Sychem into the sepulchre of Abraham: And then behold these three difficulties: First, their father of whom Abraham bought the ground, must have two names. Secondly, it is hard and harsh to believe, that in the removall of the Patriarchs bones the Israelites would carrie them over to Sychem, and so passe by Hebron close to the *Abrahamicum*, or the cave where Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with their wives, were buried, and afterwards remove the bones back again from Sychem unto the sepulchre which Abraham bought, which is fixscore miles (if not more) if we measure from Hebron to Sychem, and so backward from Sychem to Hebron. Calvarie and the citie of Jerusalem lay almost even in the way from Goshen to Sychem, and from Sychem back to Hebron: And on Calvarie or there abouts, certainly they would have deposed their bones, if they desired the translation of them to rise with Christ. Thirdly, this exposition implieth, since Joseph was one of the Fathers, that Joseph was also buried in the sepulchre of Abraham; which is disproved by Josh. 24. 32. And yet, that we may make this Exposition passable and probable, let us consider the answers. The first difficultie is cleared by saying, It is an usuall thing in the Scripture for the same man to have two names; as Solomon is called *Jedidiah*, 2. Sam. 12. 25. and the like. To the second difficulne this answer may be shaped, That though we could see no reason, nor could imagine any end, why they should carrie and recarrie these bones; yet reasons and just motives might then lead them, which we now may be ignorant of. But I take it as evident, that the Israelites sooner and more quickly possessed the tribe of Ephraim, and the citie of Sychem (and therefore there might they leave their bones for a time) then Hebron or

or Jerusalem. For Joshuah in his time called a Parliament or a Diet at Sychem, Josh. 24. 1. and the Ephraimites peaceably enjoyed their inheritance in Joshuah his dayes, and the Canaanites served under tribute unto them, Josh. 16. 10. But after Joshuah his death, they wan Jerusalem and Hebron, Judg. 1. 8, 10. and then they might recarry the bones of the Fathers to the *Abrahamians* by Hebron. The third knot is loosed, if we may say, that all the Fathers were carried into Abraham's cave, who had not a distinct burial-place of their own, as Joseph had, who accordingly was not buried by Hebron, but by Sychem.

6. The second way of expounding S. Stephen, according as the words lie in the Greek and Latine copies, is this, That the other Patriarchs the sonnes of Jacob were buried by Sychem, as Joseph was; and their bones brought up with his, when the Israelites came out of Egypt, and laid in the sepulchre which Jacob the grandchilde of Abraham bought for a summe of money *of the sonnes of Hemor the father of Sychem*, as is expressely said, Josh. 24. 32. Which latter way, for the accordance of words and names both in the Old and New Testament, I do most willingly embrace. For it representeth not unto us so many or so great difficulties; yea none at all, since it was not so strange that the word *Abraham* should be a patronymick, and used for *Jacob*, especially when Rehoboam is called *David*, and *the sonne of Jesse*, and Abraham is said to be *the father of Levi*, which Jacob was, and the Israelites are termed *Joseph*, Psal. 81. 5. though most of them descended not from him; and they who ascended out of Egypt, issued from Joseph after divers generations. In two of which places most punctually, as well as here, the grandfathers names are put for the grandchildren. Especially let this be throughly considered, that the grandchilde himself is distinctly described in other places of the divine storie, to have bought the same ground of the sonnes of Hemor, about Sychem, *for an hundred pieces of money*, Gen. 33. 19. and the grandfather Abraham not to have bought that, but an other piece of ground, at an other time, in an other place, for * *foure hundred shekels of silver* of Ephron the Hittite, neare Hebron, which was farre distant from Sychem. Which sale of Ephron, and purchase of Abraham, is ratified by the witnesse of truth, in the mouth of Jacob himself, and dying Jacob, Genes. 49. 29, &c. Therefore though the name of *Abraham* be read, it may be, it must be a patronymick, and *Jacob* is called by his grandfathers name, and *Jacob* did what is ascribed to *Abraham*, for other passages of Scripture do force us to expound it of Jacob.

* Genes. 23. 16, &c.

This have I digressed, to satisfie the great doubt which hath tortured the wits both of old and late Writers.

O Lord God, God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, God of our fathers, Father of Jesus Christ our God and Saviour; be pleased, I beseech thee, that these my poore weak labours in points obscure, may receive strength from thy strength, light from thy light; that thy most blessed, holy, and all-wise Word may be a lanthorn and light, not onely to my paths, but to my understanding: that so I may know thee, love thee, and alway cleaving to thee, may be glorified by thee, through Jesus Christ my Redeemer and Advocate. Amen.

CHAP. XI.

1. *Pineda makes Moses to be one of the raised at Christs Passion, if once he died. Pineda censured for his assertion, or rather his* hypothesis.

2. *David then arose in Pineda his judgement.*

3. *His Argument answered. Bishop* Bilson *wavering, and rejected, as he rejecteth S. Augustine.*

4. *A demonstration (upon S. Augustine his ground, and Act. 2. 24.) that David was not raised, nor ascended bodily into heaven.*

5. *Davids sepulchre now kept by the Turk.*

I Return to my old task against Pineda, and of him I demand, Who else are said to arise about the time of Christs Passion, besides Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? He hath alreadie answered: *Moses also lived again, if long since he died once.* I answer; Why doth he make a needlesse *if*? The Scripture saith expressely, he *died*, Deut. 34. 5. and *he was an hundred and twentie yeares old when he died*, vers. 7. and he was *buried*, vers. 6. *If he died not, yet then first was he partaker of celestiall blessednesse*, saith Pineda, *after Christ was risen.* But in Christs life (say I) *Moses and Elias appeared in glory, and spake of his decease*, Luk. 9. 30, 31. They were not onely glorified, but they did appeare gloriously to Christ, and his Apostles, before his resurrection. And if S. Ambrose hath such words as Pineda citeth, we may trulie reply, [b] *We never read that Moses was, or was seen in heavenly glorie, after Christ arose, but before.*

[a] *At fuerit quoq; redivivus Moses, si olim diem suum obiit.*

[b] *Mosen usquam in cœlesti gloria legimus postquam, sed antequam Christus resurrexit.*

2. From

2. From this his pendulouſneſſe concerning Moſes, he deſcendeth to others, [c] *David was one of them, and was not excluded.* I confeſſe with the divine S. Auguſtine, that if any did ariſe to the eternall glory both of their ſouls and bodies, David may be thought to be one (neither then will I exclude Adam, Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, and other Patriarchs under the law of Nature) but Auguſtine in the ſame 99 Epiſtle *ad Euod.* cited by Pineda, proveth by divers reaſons, that they who aroſe out of their graves, aroſe not then to an eternall happineſſe.

3. Yea, but Sophronius in his Sermon of the moſt bleſſed Virgins Aſſumption, evinceth (ſaith Pineda) that David did then ariſe; becauſe S. Peter, ſpeaking of the death of David, Act. 2. 20. ſaith not, His bodie was at Jeruſalem; but, *His ſepulchre is with us.* Cajetan on Aquin. *part.* 1. *quæſt.* 53. *artic.* 3. addeth (aſcribing it to Hierom) that S. Peter ſaid, [d] *Whoſe SEPULCHRE is with us, as if he durſt not ſay, Whoſe BODIE is with us.* Biſhop Bilſon in the place afore-cited, is either for us, or dubious, in the rere or end, although he be peremptorie and adverſe to us in the front and beginning: for he holdeth, That it would ſomewhat impeach the power of Chriſts reſurrection, if it were able to raiſe the Saints to life, but not to preſerve them in life. I anſwer, The queſtion is not of what Chriſt *could do*, or *can do*; but what he *did do*, and what *was done*. *A Poſſe ad Eſſe non valet argumentum.* And if he imagineth that it impeacheth the power of Chriſts reſurrection, unleſſe *de facto* the raiſed Saints be now alive in their bodies, (which is his intent) any indifferent reader will ſay he is amiſſe, and ought not to ſquare the power of Chriſts reſurrection to his own fancie. Yea, but ſaith he, *The whole fact will ſeem rather an apparition, then a true reſurrection.* I anſwer, If he take *apparition* for a phantaſticall viſion, and meer imagination, or a deluſion of the ſenſes, his meaning is not to be ſuffered: yet in a good ſenſe and at large it may be called *an apparition*, for *they appeared unto many*, Matth. 27. 53. A true apparition, and as true a reſurrection. A true reſurrection is of two ſorts: the *firſt*, and the *laſt*; a *good*, and a *better* reſurrection: of which I ſpake before. One *eternall*. Such was Chriſts; *Chriſt dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him*, Rom. 6. 9. and, *He hath the keyes of death*, Revel. 1. 18. yea, he alone was bleſſed with this reſurrection: hereafter we ſhall; *Every man in his own order. Chriſt the firſt-fruits, afterward they that are Chriſts, at his coming*, ſaith the Apoſtle, 1. Cor. 15. 23. The very time is expreſſed. S. Paul wrote this after Chriſts firſt coming; yea after his reſurrection many yeares: and therefore you muſt needs interpret it of his ſecond coming, as is moſt evident by the context: Therefore either thoſe

[c] *Neque abfuerit omnino David.*

[d] *Cujus ſepulchrum apud nos eſt; quaſi non auſus fuerit dicere, cujus corpus apud nos eſt*

thoſe Saints are not Chriſts, or they ſhall ariſe at his laſt coming; and therefore have not riſen to an eternall reſurrection. The other true reſurrection is *temporaria*. Thus ſome were raiſed in the Old Teſtament, and ſome in the New: and though they died again, I dare not ſay their reſurrection was an apparition. And as out of doubt ſome of them who were raiſed by the Prophets, or by Chriſt in his life time, died ſooner then other: ſo if any of them had died within three or foure dayes, yea within an houre or two after that their reſurrection; yet had it not been an *apparition* onely, but a true *temporary reſurrection*. As, if a childe ſhould die the third inſtant after the ſouls infuſion, there were a true union, and a true death: ſo if one ſhould die again preſently after a reſurrection, there muſt needs be both a true reunion, reſurrection, and a ſecond death: God reuniting the ſoul, and again ſeparating it, and diſpoſing of the creature without its wrong, to the glorie of the Creatour.

If I be bold with Biſhop Bilſon, he is as bold with S. Auguſtine, and fleighteth his reaſons, and croſſeth the very argument which Aquinas magnifieth, and which we have now in hand concerning David. All the Reverend Biſhops words are too large to be tranſcribed; you may reade them, pag. 217. and 218. I will onely ſingle out ſuch paſſages, as ſhew him to be ſingular or dubious in that point. *That David is not aſcended into heaven, doth not hinder* (ſaith he) *but David might be tranſlated into Paradiſe with the reſt of the Saints that roſe from the dead when Chriſt did: but it is a juſt probation, that Davids bodie was not then aſcended, when Chriſt ſat in his humane nature at the right hand of God.* Again he ſaith, *Auguſtine hath ſome hold to prove that David did not aſcend in body when Chriſt did, or at leaſt not into heaven, whither Chriſt aſcended: becauſe in plain words Peter ſaith,* * DAVID IS NOT ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN, *But* (ſaith he) *either the bodies of the Saints ſlept again, when they had given teſtimonie to Chriſts reſurrection, or they were placed in Paradiſe, and there expect the number of their brethren, which ſhall be raiſed out of the duſt: or laſtly, David was none of theſe that were raiſed to bear witneſſe of Chriſts reſurrection, but onely ſuch were choſen, as were known to the perſons then living in Jeruſalem.* So farre Biſhop Bilſon.

* Acts 2.34.

Before I come to preſſe the argument, let me deſire the Reader to obſerve theſe things in the forecited words, and to cenſure accordingly. That the Saints may be in *Paradiſe* with their bodies, but not in *Heaven*. Is there any paradiſe but in heaven? and when S. Paul was in paradiſe, was he not in the third heaven? Shall the Saints that roſe upon Chriſts reſurrection, and (if they aſcended at all) aſcended upon his aſcention, Shall they (I ſay) be taken up from the earth,

and not be glorified? or being glorified, not be with Christ? Shall they be kept at distance from the blessed spirits of Angels and men, that attend upon the Lambe; and hang between the earth and that heaven where their Redeemer reigneth? Secondly, against his former determination, and against the reasons which he brought to confirm it, he saith, *Either the bodies of the Saints slept again*, (But doth it not impeach the power of Christs resurrection? or, will it not seem an apparition, rather then a true resurrection, as you before reasoned?) *or they were placed in Paradise, or David was none of those who were raised to bear witnesse of Christs resurrection.* You see now his resolution is come down; but S. Augustines argument is sound, that David was not excluded from that priviledge, which other ancient Fathers and Patriarchs enjoyed, if they enjoyed them. Bishop Bilson himself confesseth, that David ascended not when Christ ascended; but Christ sat in his humane nature at the right hand of God, when Davids bodie was not ascended. If not then, when did he or they ascend? or how were they witnesses of his ascension? Lastly, that the Fathers before Christ were in blisse, is out of doubt: that they were in some mansion of heaven, is probable: that they were comforted and made happier by Christs exaltation, may be beleeved: But that either the souls of the Patriarchs, and David, are not with the other blessed Angels and spirits of men now where Christ is; or that the Apostles and Evangelists, and other most holy disciples of Christ, do not follow the Lambe whersoever he now is, but are in a paradise out of heaven, seems strange divinitie, somewhat touching on the errour of the Chiliasts. But I leave Bishop Bilson, in this point unlike himself; he being a chief of our worthies, famous above thousands for a most learned Prelate.

4. And if from the ground of S. Augustine, and the words of S. Peter, I do not demonstrate that David rose not to an eternall resurrection; I am much deceived. The confessed ground of S. Augustine is, That it is hard and harsh to exclude David from being one that arose, if any arose, to eternall life: so that if David arose not, none may be thought of them so to arise, as to ascend in their immortall bodies to heaven; since he had greater gifts or priviledges then some of them, and as great as almost any of them. But say I, David was none of those that arose; or if he did, he ascended not into heaven. And this I will undertake to prove by S. Peter. For first, S. Augustine in the same Epistle saith, The intent of S. Peter was to prove that these words, Psal. 16. 10. *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption*, were spoken of Christ onely, and not of David: and the Apostle evinceth it by this reason, Because David did

die,

die, and was buried, and *his ſepulchre is with us*, that is, his bones and his bodie, and his aſhes are yet with us: whereas if David had bodily aſcended, they would have fitted David as well as Chriſt; who died, and was buried, and his ſepulchre remained; but his bodie was not incinerated, neither was his fleſh corrupted, as Davids was, but aſcended: And ſo the Apoſtles argument had been impertinent. Secondly, it is ſaid moſt remarkably, Act. 2. 34. *David is not aſcended into the heavens.* But Chriſt is by Davids confeſſion.

Note firſt the force of the *Anthitheſis*. Secondly, obſerve that S. Peter ſpake this after Chriſts aſcenſion into heaven; whereas if any aroſe to incorruptible glorie, they aroſe or aſcended with Chriſt; and ſo, by juſt conſequent, before this time when S. Peter ſpake theſe words: yet the Apoſtle ſaith, Οὐ γὰρ Δαβὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, *He is not yet aſcended*, or, *He hath not aſcended into the heavens.* Again, though David were in heaven in his ſoul long before that time, as we ſay; or if he went up out of *Limbus Patrum*, as ſome Papiſts ſay: yet certainly ſomeway he was not aſcended, when S. Peter thus preached. If any way he aſcended not, it muſt needs be in *bodie* or *ſoul*. They dare not ſay, He aſcended not in *ſoul*: and therefore we may boldly ſay, He aſcended not in *bodie*; unleſſe they will ſhew us ſome third nature in David that might aſcend, which thwarteth both Philoſophie and Divinitie.

5. Moreover, the Turks now inhabiting Jeruſalem keep the ſepulchre of David, forbidding entrance to all Chriſtians into it, as every traveller into thoſe parts knoweth, and they queſtionleſſe reſpect the ſepulchre, as containing the bodie, bones, or aſhes of David there preſent and unremoved. Laſtly, if David aſcended not when Chriſt did, or a little after, which is evidenced from the words of S. Peter, our enemies themſelves will not ſay that he aſcended long after, or of late: Therefore David is not aſcended bodily as yet, howſoever Pineda fancieth.

O Moſt mercifull Saviour, the ſonne of David, the Lord of David, who haſt ſupereminently the Key of David, and openeſt and no man ſhutteth, and ſhutteſt and no man openeth: when in all contriteſt humilitie I caſt my ſelf down to the gates of hell, I beg, and call, and crie unto thee, that thou wouldeſt ſhut them; And open unto me (I beſeech thee) the gates of heaven, and lift up for me thoſe everlaſting doores, that I may come in to thee the King of glorie, and ſit at thy feet of thy ſervants in thoſe celeſtiall manſions. Grant this, O moſt Bleſſed Jeſu, for thine own ſweet names ſake, and for the merit of thy death and paſſion. Amen.

CHAP. XII.

1. *Pineda doubteth whether Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, were raised at Christs Passion; because there now are said to be some reliques of them; some at Rome, and some at Venice, saith Lorinus.*

2. *Other reliques. The table at which Christ ate with his Apostles. Some hairs, said to be the hairs of our glorious Saviour: others, of his all-gracious mother. A bone of Philips. A sandal of S. Peters.*

3. *S. Peters chain miraculous, as they report.*

4. *Mr. Mountague, now the reverend Bishop of Chichester, defended.*

5. *S. Pauls chain also miraculous, from Gregorie and Bellarmine.*

6. *False reliques taxt by Erasmus and Calvin. John the Baptist Τετράδακος, supposed to have three heads at the least. Three or foure prepuces of Christ.*

7. *Reliques before Christs time. The ark. The holy oyl. The rod of Moses and Aaron. The throne of Esermitis fancied by the Jews. The horns of Moses. One finger of the holy Ghost. The Papists faules in forging of false reliques.*

8. *All Reliques are not false. What respects are to be denied to true Reliques.*

9. *What are to be given.*

10. *No likelihood of the raising up of Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, about Christs passion.*

THe same Pineda is a little more reserved in the persons following; for he onely addeth this, *I would say that Ananias, Azarias, and Misael did now arise also: but that their reliques are said to remain this day amongst men. Part at Rome, part at Venice,* saith Lorinus on Act. 2. 29. I marvell that neither Christ, nor any of his Apostles ever went to visit them; that none of the primitive Church went ever on pilgrimage to them; and that none of the ancient Fathers ever mentioned them. And certes, I did think, till of late, that the

the Papists had no reliques beyond the dayes of the Apostles, or the birth of Christ. From that time they say (whatsoever they think) that they have store of them. That I may not reckon among them, the very same table whereon Christ sat with his blessed Apostles, *which was at Toledo*, saith Joannes Leo, in his first book of the historie of Africk, which Table being covered with pure gold, and adorned with great store of precious stones, was esteemed to be worth half a million of ducates, and was at the sack of Toledo transported into Africa. *They expose sometimes to shew, three hairs of the beard of Christ*, saith Mr. Morison pag. 38. And, *part of the hairs of the most glorious mother of our Lord, and a bone of Philip the Apostle, to be seen at Venice*, saith the same author. Pererius himself, *Disput. 45. in primum cap. Joannis Evang.* saith, *They shew the sandal of S. Peter in the Church of Oniedo in Spain.* And Baronius saith, *They have the chain with which S. Peter was tied at Jerusalem, when the Angel delivered him.* Of which they have, even to a wonder, strange and different relations.

3. For that chain being sent by Eudocia to her daughter Eudoxia to Rome (for the other chain and S. Peters sword were kept still at Constantinople) by divine miracle was conjoyned to that other chain, wherewith S. Peter was bound in Rome under Nero, whilest he was in prison. Here Baronius himself, *ad annum Christi 439. num. 7.* *Ecclesiastical records have it, that these two chains being compared together, are found to be of the same kinde, art, or fashion: and by miracle were coupled one to the other: and being joyned or united together, of two chains were made one.* In memorie of which chain, the kalends of August were made an holyday by the Bishop of Rome, and a Church dedicated to God, according to the name, *Sancti Petri ad vincula.*

a *Habent tabulæ Ecclesiasticæ, ambas has catenas simul collatas, ejusdem generis & artis inventas, sibi invicem miraculo copulatas, junctásque, ac simul unitas, ex duabus unam effectam esse.*

4. Let me a little digresse in defence of my ancient friend and chamber-fellow Mr. Mountague, now the reverend Bishop of Chichester: who is not rigidly to be expounded, as he is by the furious Papists and Puritans: for though in his answer to the Gag, pag. 235. he saith, *Baronius observeth S. Peters chain was not found till Augustine was dead*: yet that learned Antiquarie could not be ignorant, that Baronius proveth, and proveth probably enough, the manner how it was kept by some of Herods ministers, and so downward. But he meaneth, as I expound him candidly, It was not found in the Church as a publick relique. For *it was not brought unto Constantinople, till Chrysostom was dead*, saith Baronius, *num.* 15. And in the dayes of Proclus there was a translation of those two chains of S. Peter from Jerusalem, or where they were kept, unto Constantinople; and shortly after, one of them was sent to Rome, as I said at first. And yet (that you may

see great Papists agreeing like *hare* and *harrow*) obiecteth that *Petrus Thyræus* a learned Iesuit, *de locis infestis, part.3. cap.67.* citeth a Sermon of S. Chrysostoms, *de Adoratione clavorum S. Petri.*

5. I return from my digression, and will make Bellarmine also shake his chains. Bellarmine, *de reliq. Sanct. l. 2.* telleth out of S. Gregorie a strange storie of S. Pauls chains. Gregorie promised to send unto Constantia the Empresse some of the filings of the chains of S. Paul, if at least any part could be filed away: For the chains had this condition, that if a worthy partie desired them, part of them would presently be filed away; if the partie desiring were unworthy, though one took great pains with all his strength to file, yet he could file away nothing. A tough smith with a good file, would (in some mens judgement) confute this miracle.

6. Other Papists in other places do shew the prepuce of Christ, *which, being a doubtfull thing, they worship more then whole Christ*, saith Erasmus. If one should question, How is Christ risen? circumcised, or uncircumcised? perchance it would puzzle them.

But why say I so? when Tolet on Luk. 2. gathereth from Titus Bostrenus on the same place, *Antiquam controversiam extitisse de præputio Christi, That there was an old controversie concerning the prepuce of Christ.* But I answer, That the Commentarie on Luke ascribed to Titus, is spurious and of latter times, as Bellarmine, *de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. pag. 130. ad annum Christi* 365. proveth. Yea, *even Chrysostom himself, and Cyrillus Alexandrinus, and Pelusiota (whom the supposed Titus doth often cite) were but children when the true Titus Bostrenus died*, saith Bellarmine. Thirdly, both Titus and Theophylact say, That Christ resumed the circumcised part at his resurrection. If they had but one authour of that antiquitie, that Christ left it on earth as a relique of his; how would they triumph? After this, Innocentius the third, somewhat above 400 yeares since, enquiring whether Christ did arise with his foreskin, saith, *Some believe it to be kept at S. Johns of Laterane: others say, Charles the great translated it to Aquisgrane, and afterwards it was left at Curesium*, and determineth nothing but this, *b it is better to referre all unto God, then rashly to determine any thing.* Yet in the sixth book of the revelation of S. Briget, cap. 112. it is said, That the glorious mother of our Lord, kept it about her wheresoever she went.

I yet do question, (if it were so) Who kept it till Brigets dayes? and, Which is the true prepuce? that at Rome? or that which Charles the great received from an Angel, and left in Germanie, not at Rome? But these books of revelations may want credit with us, when the learned Francis Collins,

b *Melius est, totum Deo committere, quàm aliquid temerè definire.*

de

de sanguine Christi, lib. 5. disput. 8. cap. 5. saith thus of a revelation in the very chapter, *Though it be of most especiall moment, yet it is not to be so thought of, as that it is impious or irreligious to differ from it.* If it be *maximi ponderis*, *of chiefest moment, and of greatest weight*, it is impious and irreligious to depart from it. But since he departs from one Legend, we may from the other.

[a] *Etsi ea sit maximi ponderis, tamen non tanti, tamque efficacis censenda est, ut ab ea discedere impium & irreligiosum fuerit.*

After this the prepuce of Christ was stolne, buried, lost, found, torn in two peeces, and is now in high esteem, if Cardinall Tolet on Luk. 2. may be beleeved. The summe of his narration is this, *That 1527, when Rome was sackt by the souldiers of the Duke of Burbon, one of them stole away, among other reliques, the prepuce of Christ, and buried it in a cellar, and, as he was dying, revealed what he had done. Pope Clement the seventh sought it to be searched for, yet it was not found. Thirty yeares after a Priest found it, carried it to the Lord-ladie of the place: she twice wrich to unvie the things wherewith it was covered, and thrice by a miracle it inhibited. Clarin a young virgin her daughter untieth all, and puts the prepuce first in a silver basin, then in a silver casket: Thus it is placed in the Church of Calcata, then removed into the Chancel. Miracles are wrought. The Pope sends Commissioners to search the truth. One of the Priests, ere he was aware, tore the prepuce in two peeces; (Is istâ eadem manerie membrana, the same numerivall skinne,* O learned Collius? *) the Commissioners certifie it was the true relique of Christ, and it is kept at this day at Calcata, in the temple of S. Cornelius, and Cyrian, where God daily works miracles.*

In the yeare 1584, at a womans request, Sixtus quintus granted plenarie indulgence for ten yeares, in the same Church of Calcata upon the day of our Lords Circumcision. Thus farre Tolet.

You may observe, that from 1527 (when it was stolne by the souldier) to 1584, or perhaps, so long as the indulgences lasted, the prepuce of Christ was not in S. John of Laterans: and so, besides the prepuce at Carefium, there are two other fore-skinnes of Christ on the earth, *One at Calcata, 20 miles from Rome, kept to this day*, saith Tolet, commenting on Luke: And the book was printed 1611. Of the other, Collius the Millanoise, *de sanguine Christi, lib. 5. disput. 7. cap. 2.* saith, *It is now kept at S. John of Laterans, in that place of the Church which is called* THE HOLY OF HOLIES, *as Innocent the third and the Cardinal S. Petri ad vincula, and Carthagena, and all and every of the writers of this age who have handled this point do say.* Collius might have excepted Tolet, whose preceding narrative checketh him. The same Collius, *ibid.* thinks it very credible, [a] *That Christ rose not with that self same fore-skinne which was cut off at his circumcision, but by a divine vertue another new one was compraduced,* Christ being in heaven uncir-

[a] *Salvatoris præputium non resurrexisse eadem numero quod in circumcisione ceciderat; sed divinâ virtute aliud fuisse compproductum.*

cumcised: but yet he upholdeth the gainfull vanitie of Impostours, who deserve to be branded, yea, to be burned to ashes, for feigning two or three foreskinnes on earth of our Saviour.

I cannot forget their vaunts, That they have *instimum matris*, the *smock*, or at least the *peticoat* of the most gracefull Virgin, and her milk, honoured almost as Christ his consecrated bodie: The breeches of Joseph: The combe of S. Anne (and *her very head*, saith Sleidan, *Comment. 15. fol. 170.*) And *so many pieces of the crosse, as would almost lade a ship of burthen*, saith Erasmus on Matth. 23. 5. Calvin, *de inventor. reliquiarum*, proveth some of the Romish Saints to have three heads; some three bodies shewn in severall places. The Rhemists on Matth. 14. *annot.* 2. say, *Honour is now done to the Baptists head at Amiens in France*: Fulk addeth, *The same part that is at Amiens, is at S. Angely; the rest of his head, from his fore-head to his neck, is at Malta; yet the under part of his skull is at Nemours; his brain at Nevers Nastraviense; another part of his head is at Jean Maurien; his jaw-bone at Vesalium, at the Church of S. John the greater; another part at Paris; a piece of his eare at S. Florides; his fore-head and hairs in Spain at S. Salvadores; another piece of his head at Naion; another at Luke in Italie: and yet for all these pieces, his whole head is at S. Sylvesters Abbey at Rome, to be seen and worshipped. Half of S. Peters bodie is at S. Peters at Rome, half at S. Paule. Yet he hath an head at S. John Laterani; and his nether jaw with the beard upon it, is in France at Poyters; at Triers are many of his bones, at Geneva was part of his brain*, saith Fulk *in Rom. 16. annot. 1.* See Sleidan *Comment. 15. pag. 169.* summing up a book of Calvins to the same purpose.

I could make you laugh in disdain at what a chief printer at Paris hath written in his preface to the defence of Herodotus, touching these horrible impostures, and the sudden quick-cousening wits of the Friars: as how a strange feather was promised to be shewn for a holy relique, as being one of an Arch-angels feathers: and when a cunning hand had stoln it away, and placed a coal in the room of it; the nimble jugling Friar perswaded his besotted auditorie, that they were unworthy to see so great a relique as an Arch-angels feather; but God had sent, in stead of it, one of the very coals with which S. Laurence was broiled to death; and thereupon shewed them the coal which was fosted in.

7. He that would rake this sink, might have his nose full. I must ascend somewhat higher, and whereas I imagined no reliques were found beyond Christ, now Salianus, *annal. tom. 6. pag. 34.* saith from report, that the heads of the seven brethren martyrs, 2. Macc. 7. 1. &c. are in a Nunnerie at Cullein,

in

in a Church of the Maccabees ſo called 600 yeares ſince. And Pineda tells us, that the reliques of Ananias, Azarias, and Miſael, are reported to remain: and not thoſe onely; for Lorinus on Act. 7. 44. ſaith, *The Scholaſticall hiſtorie reporteth, that the Ark was carried in triumph to Rome, and is kept in the Church of Laterane.* Lorinus indeed diſliketh that opinion: but it may paſſe as well as this, *That unto Lewis the eleventh were brought the holy oyl, and the rod of Moſes and Aaron*; as the French hiſtorie hath it at the end of his life. How miſſed they a piece of Noahs Arke? (for I take it, that the Scholaſticall hiſtorie ſpeaketh of the *Arca Teſtamenti*) and the fruit of ſome of the trees of Paradiſe? A parcell of the *Tohu-Bohu* had been an excellent relique, as the primitive and ancienteſt remainder of the unformed lump and maſſe of the firſt immediate creation. For a piece of that Nothing out of which the *Tohu-Bohu* was made, cannot be had, ſince Nothing hath no parts.

If the Papiſts did think with the Jews, that *Solium Æternitatis, The Throne of Eternitie*, was one of thoſe things, which was made before the grand creation (as Mr. Calvin relateth concerning the Jews, on Micah 5. 2.) ſome of the Papiſts perhaps would outſtrip the Jews, and ſay, that they had a relique even of that Throne.

In no foolerie have the Papiſts prejudiced themſelves, more then in this, yea, they are not onely come to that degree of infatuation, as to feigne that they can ſhew the horns of Moſes (which were meerly *non entia, none at all*; growing onely in the imagination of the deceivers, and deceived) but they are carried even *in ultimum impietatis, to that height of madneſſe*, that they ſay, they have had (*horreſco referens, I quake to write it*) one of the fingers of the holy Ghoſt; which was a moſt blaſphemous impoſture, I had almoſt ſaid, *πὰρ ὑγρὸν, above and beyond pardon.* See Mr. Sheldon in his book concerning the miracles of Antichriſt, pag. 339. Sleidan, *Comment. 4. fol. 37. ad annum Dom. 1624.* ſaith, That among other things it was decreed in an aſſembly of the Helvetians at Lucerna, this, [a] *Let not them be laughed at, who carrie about the reliques of the holy Ghoſt, of the Virgin Mary, of S. Antonie.* And yet the ſame Sleidan, *Comment. 21. fol. 129.* makes it to be a part of the very pretended reformation, to be made even by the Papiſts themſelves, *That they who carry about the reliques of S. Antonie, are to be put down; becauſe they lead the people into ſuperſtition, and cozen them.* Their own learned Valla and Vives reproved this mercenary juggling; and long before them, *Glaber Radulphus Cluniacenſis Monachus, in Hiſtoria ſui temporis, lib. 4. cap. 3.* tels ſtrange ſtories of *Leger de la main* about reliques, and of their working of miracles, which he aſcribeth to

[a] *Qui ſancti Spiritus, Mariæ virginis, divi Antonii circumferunt reliquias, à nemine rideantur.*

to devils, or humane errours. Likewise, the moderate ingenuous, unsiding, learned George Cassander, *Consult. art.* 21. hath branded them, and giveth some advice concerning them, especially against the false reliques.

8. I speak not unreverently of any true relique, and I think many both Orientall and Occidentall reliques were and are true; and fully beleeve, that divers holy reliques were in this last age torn down, and buried in ruines, by those sacrilegious hot-brains in the giddie whirl; or by those Turkish acquists, which in a whirlwinde regarded more the benefit of sinfull men, then the good of souls, or glory of God in the beautie of his Churches.

If I could see one undoubted ancient relique of the best sort, (for they do much differ) I would *reverence*, though not *worship* it. [f] *The martyrs are to be very highly esteemed, yet not to be adored as God*, saith Ludovicus Vives on Augustine *de Civit. Dei*, 8.27. and establisheth it out of Hierom. The same say I of reliques: and thus expound my self in particulars; First, negatively; Secondly, positively. I would not kneel unto any relique, much lesse pray unto it; nor say (as the Papists do) to the *Sudarium Christi*, [g] *Holy napkin pray for us, and free us from the plague*. Or to the linen handkerchief of Veronica, [h] *All hail holy face, printed or stamped on this handkerchief, cleanse us from all the blots of our sinnes.* Nor to any part of the crosse, or to all of it, if I saw it intire, would I crie, [i] *God speed, O crosse; do thou save us*. Yet such idolatrie Scharpius imputeth to the Papists. I would not light lights before the bones or ashes of a martyr; which Hierom condemneth as the dotage of superstitious women, who have zeal, but not knowledge. I would not erect altars, temples, or appoint holy dayes, or form a prayer to worship them; but to God for them. All these are derogatorie to the honour of the Almightie.

If I were sure to have help if I prayed unto a relique, I would not pray, and would refuse that help. I would not dig up the bodie, or any part of the bodie of the greatest Saint buried, unlesse it were buried in unseemly and unfit places: then would I not worship it, but translate it to a decent sepulchre. The bodies of the Patriarchs, Jacob and Joseph, were not taken up to be kept as reliques, but to be translated to their severall sepulchres: and David caused the bones of his deerest Jonathan, when they had been carried from Gilboah to the street of Beth-shan, from Beth-shan to Jabesh-Gilead, to be buried in Zelah of Benjamin, in the sepulchre of Kish, 2.Sam.21.12, &c. He kept them not for reliques, nor worshipped them.

I would not give so much reverence to any relique, as I would

[f] *Venerandi sunt martyres, non adorandi ut Deus.*

[g] *Sanctum sudarium ora pro nobis, & libera nos à peste.*

[h] *Salve sancta facies, impressa panniculo, nos ab omni macula purga vitiorum.*

[i] *O crux, ave; salva nos.*

would to the Saint himself, if I were divinely ascertained, that the Saints soul presented it self in a shape unto me: and yet I would not fall down to worship that Saint, and should I to his relique? I would not *religiosè venerari, relatiuè adorare*, (as *Petrus Thyreus, de variis miracul. part. 1. cap. 3.* confesseth the Papists do.) But what saith sober S. Augustine on Psal. 98.5. *I am in doubt, I am afraid to adore earth, lest he damn me who made both heaven and earth. In this beholding or pondering of my self, I turne my self to Christ, and here I seek and finde, how without impietie earth may be worshipped.* As if no earthly thing should be adored, but his bodie onely.

I would not say or think, that any reliquе or reliques have in themselves, or from themselves power to expell devils, or to work wonders: for *spiritual power* (as Thyreus well observeth, though he would himself) *is not within a thing corporeall, and a bodily power cannot drive away devils*; or work miracles, say I. The great works of healing, &c. which have been done at the tombes of Martyrs, (saith S. Augustine *de civitat. Dei, 22.8.*) might in those dayes extraordinarily, be done by the Martyrs, or by the Angels *in assumed bodies like to the Martyrs*, as Augustine phraseth it, *in lib. de cura pro mortuis gerenda, cap. 16.*

The reliques have no vertue in themselves, to effectuate or actuate such miracles: yea, the very Angels or Martyrs themselves, were but the agents, instruments, and the right hand of the Almighty, who onely worketh great wonders by his power independent.

I would put no trust, no confidence in the relique of any Saint or Martyr whosoever, or whatsoever, for help either of soul or bodie: For this also is a wrong offered unto him in whose name our help standeth: *Our help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth*, Psal. 121.2. And *my God shall supply all our need, according to his riches in glorie by Christ Jesus*, Philip. 4.19.

9. What would I then do? or how would I behave my self toward a true, unquestioned, choice relique? I would (which is the positive part by me promised) with Chrysostom, *Hom. 5. in Job, tom. 1.* honourably esteem of it, (saith he, and reverently both touch it, and behold it, and think of it, and charily lay it up: I would shew it to others not mercenarily, but with joyfull and comfortable remembrance of him whose relique it was: I would esteem of it above silver, gold, or precious stones: I would make it my remembrancer of things past; as a motive stirring me up to the imitation of that Saints vertues and actions, which is their best relique: I would use it as a bridle to curb evil in me, and as a spur to goodnesse. If any instrument of Satan should debase it, and say

k *Anceps factus sum: timeo adorare terram, ne damnet me qui fecit cælum & terram: fluctuans converto me ad Christum, quia ipsum quæro hic, & invenio, quomodo sine impietate adoretur terra.*

l *Suscipientes personam Martyrum.*

m *Sæpe hoc vilissimo sortus ex pulvere.*

say that it is *vilissimus pulvis*, I would scorne his scorn, and esteem it as a most especiall instrument of the most High; and would fly to the cavilles, or rather to his master Lucifer the Father of lies and detraction, *Even this which thou callest most vile dust, hath often tormented thee*, as S. Hierom said of old. Lastly, till of it self it decayed, and by its imperfection or rottennesse called for interment, I would not bury it: but commend it to be kept even in Churches and other holy places; except idolatrie were committed with it, or people in their profane religion adored it: And then would I also burie it.

10. Much more might be said, but I must take *mensam de tabula*, or *make a quick end*; and returning to Pineda, say, That if Ananias, Azarias, and Misael have no relique now remaining, which Lorinus reports from report, if they did arise, or intend to arise with Christ, they having a farre longer journey from the place of their captivitie to the Sepulchre of Christ, then Jacob had to the land of Goshen, would, or should have had as great a care as Jacob, of transfering their bones, if Jacob transfered his in hope to arise with Christ, as Pineda intimateth.

O Gracious God, who art to be loved by me for thine own self onely, Grant, I beseech thee, that no worldly thought may nestle and breed in me, nor that I may fasten any respect on any creature, which may be derogatorie to the devotion due to thee my Creator, for Jesus Christ his sake, in whom onely thou art well pleased. Amen.

CHAP. XIII.

1. *Pineda saith, Jonas arose then, and Noah. His reasons very shallow.*

2. *Daniel arose, saith Pineda from Mosen. If Daniel arose, he arose but with one leg: the other leg is yet shewed at Vercellis.*

3. *Job arose now, saith Pineda. His proof lame. Jobs Epitaph poeticall. His sepulchrall pyramis made of imagination.*

4. *Job shall arise at the generall judgement. Pineda wrincheth the Scripture.*

5. The

5. *The end of Jobs book, according to ſome Greek copies: a double expoſition of the words.*

6. *Jobs bodie ſuppoſed to be tranſlated to Conſtantinople.*

7. *Bartholomaus Sibylla ſaith, S. Hierom is expreſſe, that the holy mother of our Lord, and John the Evangeliſt, are bodily aſcended. The like cited from Aquinas. And Holcot ſaith, That the glorious virgins bodie was not to be incinerated. Her ſuppoſed day of Aſſumption, moſt honoured among the Papiſts: and yet there is monſtrous diſagreeing among them who favour her Aſſumption. The laſt inſtances concern not our queſtion.*

8. *Pineda preſumed too farre upon uncertainties. Lorinus dareth not name any particularly that were raiſed. It cannot be known certainly.*

NOw alſo aroſe *Jonah*, ſaith Pineda. That Jonas was a lively type of Chriſts reſurrection, appeareth Matth. 27. 40. But if every lively type of Chriſt aroſe, then Samſon, Samuel, Joſhuah, Gedeon, Melchizedech, Aaron, Solomon, then hundreds of others aroſe, whom Pineda mentioneth not. [a] *At laſt Noah aroſe*, ſaith Pineda. Why At laſt? *ſince he was living before other, and great in Gods favour: who was ſaved and delivered from the common deſtruction of all mortall men.* This laſt reaſon as well holdeth, That every one that was in the Ark aroſe alſo: For they were delivered, as well as Noah, from the inundation of waters, and eſpecially Sem, who was an holy man, and was great in Gods favour.

[a] *Tandem reſurrexit Noah.*

2. *And Daniel aroſe, who was brought out of the lions den*, ſaith Pineda, and he proves it by Nicetas. But neither he, nor Nicetas proves it by any reaſon. He might as well argue, that Jeremie aroſe with Chriſt: Becauſe he being caſt into the dungeon where he ſunk in the mire, was afterwards drawn out of the dungeon, Jerem. 38. 6. and 13. And if Daniel aroſe, he aroſe but with one leg: for [b] *A leg of Daniel is kept at Vercellis, a citie of Liguria*, ſaith Lorinus on Act. 2. 29. *Daniel died in Babylan*, ſaith Sixtus Senenſis concerning him. Of reliques he makes no mention, nor of his riſing again with Chriſt: but alledgeth the laſt of Daniel, the laſt verſe: Which words may prove that he aroſe not with Chriſt; or, if he did, that he died again. For the Spirit ſaith to him, *Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou ſhalt reſt and ſtand in thy lot at the end of the dayes*, IN FINE DIERUM. Which words are applied by Vatablus, to the reſurrection of the laſt judge-

[b] *Crus Danielis aſſervatur Vercellis, &c.*

ment; which was mentioned, Dan. 12.2. And lest any should interpret *the rising out of the dust*, vers. 2. (as Porphyrie did) for *their creeping out of the holes and caverns, in the time of the Maccabees*, Lyra expressely contradicteth it, and saith, it is to be understood [c] *of the true resurrection in the end of the world*; implying, that Daniel shall *then* arise, as *he arose not*, saith Lyra, *at the time of the Maccabees, nor at the opening of the graves, before Christs resurrection.*

[c] *De resurrectione vera in fine mundi.*

[d] *Therefore most holy Job arose also*, saith Pineda, equalling Noah, Daniel, and Job, in this priviledge. But the consequence is lame; for Ezechiel doth not mention the equall priviledges of these three, in their resurrection, (though perhaps this latter is figured out) but onely the delivery from famine, or death by famine, (Ezech. 14. 13, &c.) of Noah, Daniel, and Job; or rather of other holy men also, designed out by their names, and like them in their severall vertues: Noah overcoming the world, Daniel the flesh, and Job the devil.

[d] *Ergò & resurrexit Job sanctissimus.*

Concerning Pineda his other proof, That Gregorie Nissen, in his third Oration of the resurrection, saith, *That the day of their resurrection who arose out of the graves, was much more joyfull to them, then the day of the generall resurrection:* If I should grant, that he said so, and that he said so truely: yet it followeth not necessarily (scarce probably) that they went with their bodies into heaven. The day of the generall resurrection is not yet come, and could not be rejoyced at but in hope.

More especially concerning Job, though Sallanus, *ad ann. mundi* 1544. *num.* 783. makes Jobs tombe-stone speak thus, [e] *This stone, O wayfaring man, kept under it dead Job, and sent forth also Job in glorie arising from the dead with Messiah our Prince:* though Pineda, his fellow-Jesuite, in the end of his Commentaries on Job, saith, That Jobs sepulchral *pyramis*, and kingly monument, was made for him by his seven sonnes and three daughters, and was framed and erected [f] *for an eternall memoriall of pietie, and most certain hope of his resurrection with our Redeemer:* yet none is ignorant that these are tricks of wit, panegyrick Eulogies, poeticall Epitaphs, even a little thwarting one another, rather then divine truths, or historicall relations.

[e] *Clausit, viator, hoc marmor aliquando mortuum, emisitque gloriosum cum Principe Messia resurgentem Jobum*

[f] *Ad pietatis memoriam sempiternâ, spémq; resurrectionis cum Redemptore certissimam.*

4. And further it is evident that Job spake of the generall resurrection, when he said, Job 19.25.&c. *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin, worms destroy this bodie, yet in my flesh shall I see God.* By which *latter*, or *last day*, we may fitly expound, not *the last day of judgement*, saith Pineda; *but the state of the Evangelicall Law, and of Christs suffering and rising; ending (by his death and resurrection) the former times, and be gin-*

beginning to appoint a new: for he is THE FATHER OF THE WORLD TO COME, Isa. 9. 6. Did ever man thus delude Scripture, and make it a nose of wax? It is scarcely worse used by our unlearned lay-Rabbies, the Doctours of Doctours. Who ever dreamed, that *Dies novissimus* should signifie so unlikely a matter? and if it did, how vain is his proof? The words are אבי עד, *Pater aeternitatis*, *The father of eternitie*, as the Interlinearie Bible reads it, and Vatablus with it, expounding the words, *The authour of eternall life*, (which hath no reference to Pineda's wilde Comment) or, *the everlasting Father*, as we translate it.

[a] *Author vitæ æternæ*

5. The Seventie indeed, and the Book of Job thus, *Job died, being old, and full of dayes*: so farre also goeth the Hebrew: and it is added in the Greek, *But it is written, that he shall again be raised up with those whom the Lord shall raise*. These words are not in the Original, nor in Aquila, nor in Symmachus, nor in the Seaventie used by Vatablus: but Theodotion so reads it, and the Vatican Edition of Sixtus so acknowledgeth it, and Origen in his epistle to Africanus confirmeth it, and Clemens Romanus, *cap. 5. lib. 6.* approveth it. Two wayes there are of expounding the word *Rursus*, *Again*. Francis Turrian the Jesuite, on the place of Clement, collecteth that Job shall not onely be raised up in the last day, at the generall resurrection: but that he should be first raised when Christ arose; and afterward, at the last day. Niceras saith better, *The word* ΑΓΑΠΗΝ *was therefore put, that his first resurrection might be understood to have been, when he was delivered from his troubles*. Which way soever you follow, we have it, That Job shall be raised at the last day of the world: And therefore he arose not with Christ: or died again, and so went not into the eternall happinesse of bodie and soul; for glorified bodies shall not be raised.

6. Lastly, there is an opinion even to this day, among the Turks, grounded no doubt on some old Tradition, *That Jobs bodie was removed from the place of his buriall, to that citie and place which is now called Constantinople*, as Mr. Fines Morison in the first part of his Itinerary, pag. 243. witnesseth. These are all that ever I read of by name, that are thought by Pineda, or others, both to rise with Christ, and to partake with him at that time of the eternall happinesse both in soul and bodie.

7. Bartholomæus Sybilla, *Peregrinarum quæstionum decade* 1. *cap. 3. quæst. 7. dubio 3.* citeth Henricus de Assia as Authour, that, *Perhaps, not onely Enoch and Elias are kept in Paradise to preach against Antichrist; but both John the Evangelist, and those that rose with Christ. Observe*, saith Sybilla, *the word* PERHAPS: *for S. Hierom saith formerly, concerning S. John*, WE DOUBT NOT

BUT BOTH S. JOHN THE EVANGELIST, AND THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARIE, DO REJOICE IN THEIR GLORIFIED FLESH WITH CHRIST. And Aquin. *in 4. sentent. distinct. 43. artic. 3.* cited by Sybilla, saith, *It is a point of faith holily to be beleeved concerning the blessed Virgin Marie, and S. John the Evangelist, that their resurrection is not deferred to the end of the world.*

[h] *Corpus benedictæ Virginis non fuit resolvendum in cineres, quia in ea fomes extinctus exititit.*

Also Holcot saith, on Wisdome, cap. 2. 2. *The bodie of the blessed Virgin was not to be turned into ashes, because in her was no fountain of ill:* from whence her asportation into heaven may seem to be confirmed. *The feast-day of her assumption is greater and more festivall then any other holy-day for her*, saith Durandus, *Rational. 7. 24.* Surely, I must needs say, we reade nothing certain concerning her death; nor is her bodie or her tombe-stone found on earth; nor did S. John the Evangelist, who out-lived her and the rest of the Apostles, by all mens consents, write any thing of her death, much lesse of her assumption; though as Christ committed her to him, so he took her *in sua*, *to his own home*, & was *a sonne* unto her, Joh. 19. 26, 27.

[i] *Monstrosa quædam discrepantia reperitur.*

Amongst those who assent to her assumption, there is monstrous diversitie, saith Baronius, *Anno Christi 48. num. 4.* Which words I wonder he would let drop from his pen, or that others of their side would suffer to be printed. Of the former instances I say the lesse, because if all which was supposed were granted, and if they had this priviledge to prevent others in their bodily glorie; yet it was long after Christs ascension; whereas my principall question was of those many that arose about Christs Passion, Who in particular they were?

8. The summe is, Pineda hath taken great pains to little purpose; hath presumed to name those whom the Scripture or any sound tradition hath left unnamed: his proofs have been so slender, as his conjectures have been bold. He convinceth not exactly, that any one of those whom he specializeth were raised; much lesse to eternall happinesse: and I have demonstrated that some of those whom he nameth did not then arise to a glorious immorralitie. In the particular instancing in those who arose about Christs death, his fellow-Jesuite dares not follow him; [k] *I dare not say peremptorily that any such an one was raised*, saith Lorinus most modestly, on Act. 7. 29. Yet still it must be confest, that *many bodies which slept arose, &c.* though the book be clasped, the secret reserved, and no absolute knowledge can inform us who they were.

[k] *Non ausus de illo particulatim definire.*

O Lord who didst open the eyes of the blinde, to thee do I confesse the blindenesse of my understanding: open, I beseech thee, those eyes of my minde, dispell the clouds leading me in the right way amidst by-paths and uncertainties; even for thine own sake, who art the onely way to the true life. So be it, Lord Jesus; Amen, Amen.

CHAP. XIIII.

1. *My conjecture, that none of the Patriarchs or old Prophets were raised.*

2. *An objection, concerning Peters knowing of Moses and Elias on mount Tabor, answered.*

3. *A conjecture that the Saints who lived in Christs time, and died before him, were raised at his Passion. Who they were in most likelihood. When Joseph, the reputed father of Christ, did die.*

4. *The end, why they were raised. To whom they appeared.*

5. *A crotchet concerning the wives of dead men which have been raised.*

IF still you presse the question, *Who those* MANY *were?* or, *Who were some of those* MANY? I answer with Lorinus, that *part of truth lieth hid and covered.* Amongst conjectures, I propound this mine own as probable. First negatively, That none of the ancient Patriarchs, Prophets, or Types of Christ in the Old Testament, arose: for if one; Who is he? and why not others as well as he? and if they had risen, Who should have known them? or how could they induce the then living to beleeve that they were the same Patriarchs or Prophets? They might have been as well thought to have been incarnate spirits: for the evil spirits also kept about the tombes and graves of the deceased: Unlesse you will multiply miracles upon miracles; and say, God by miracle did reveal these to be true Patriarchs: Otherwise they could not prove it to those who lived 2000 yeares after them. And if there had been such miracles, the Evangelists would not have slipt them.

2. Yea, but S. Peter knew Moses and Elias at Christs transfiguration, though they were taken away from among men long before: And therefore the then living might know the dead Patriarchs and holy men raised, though they died long before. I answer, That S. Peter, and the other Apostles James and John, might know by the conference between Christ and Moses and Elias, who they were: Whereas Christ never conversed or conferred with those that were raised, for ought that is recorded, or probably to be maintained. And

it is a figment to say or imagine, that there was any third person, which knew both the then raised on the one side, and the living which never had been dead on the other side; or could give assurance that the raised were such and such Patriarchs and Fathers. Nor were their testimonies to be taken one for another, since the deniall or doubt concerning any one, draweth in the deniall or doubt of all the rest: and upon supposall of one false apparition, any one and every one of the rest might be questioned. Secondly, S. Peter and S. John might know Moses and Elias by divine revelation, which to them was not unfrequent: as Christs Divinitie was revealed to Peter, Matth. 16.17. and Ananias his heart, Act. 5.3, &c. or as Luke knew by the Spirit that Peter wept bitterly, though Peter wept secretly: for he went out first, Luk. 22.62. and what he went out purposely to conceal, shall we think that he did purposely reveal? Now though the Apostles had supernall illumination guiding them into all truth; yet that by divine revelation extraordinary every one of them then living at Jerusalem knew every one of them who were raised and appeared unto them, is, unnecessarily to multiply many miracles. Now since *they* knew not the persons of the raised by Christ, nor any other *third person*, nor by *heavenly instruction*; they could no way know the raised Patriarchs, unlesse by their pictures or statues: which of all other wayes is most unprobable, as being a course not practised in those times and places.

The argument now hath received its answer. Peter might many wayes, and did some way know Moses and Elias: and yet I finde not any way whereby the inhabitants of the holy citie could personally know the Patriarchs and Fathers, being before buried and incinerated: And therefore I probably conclude, Not any one of these were raised.

3. Secondly, my positive probable conjecture is this, (which also seemeth more likely to Lucas Brugensis) That many of those Saints who lived in Christs time, and beleeved in him, whose memorie was fresh, and whose children, kindred, or acquaintance were yet living, and who were known to adhere to Christ (and to this opinion Bishop Bilson seemeth somewhat to encline) Many (I say) of those dead Saints now arose, and appeared unto many: as, it may be, John the Baptist (though the deceitfull miracle-mongers shew the false reliques of that good Saints head in divers places) and Zacharie and Elisabeth his parents, and those many, Luk. 1.66. and those shepherds, Luk. 2.18. and those wonderers, to whom the shepherds told our Saviours nativitie, Luk. 2.18. perhaps some would adde those wisemen, who came to worship Christ, Matth. 2.1. and old Simeon, and Anna the Prophetesse, and

Joseph Christs reputed father (though some think that Joseph lived after Christs resurrection: and yet others say, he died the twelfth yeare of Christs age; to whom Baronius rather inclineth: [a] *Joseph being very aged, about 80 yeares old, when he was espoused to the holiest Virgin*, as Epiphanius and others do guesse. For my part, I embrace the mean, and tread in the middle path: Neither thinking that Joseph died the 12 yeare, for when Christ was twelve yeares old, Joseph went up to Jerusalem, Luke 2. 42. and after Christs descent to Nazareth, Christ was obedient to Joseph and the all-gracious Virgin, vers. 51. therefore Joseph could not be dead in the twelfth yeare of Christ; which the learned Baronius did supinely and sluggishly passe over, and not observe: Nor yet do I imagine on the other side, that he lived beyond Christs resurrection, or till his death; since there is frequent mention of Christs Apostles, of his holy mother, and of his cousins, and friends, men and women, yea of strangers; and no mention, nor intimation at all, that Joseph lived till Christ began publickly to preach, and do miracles; much lesse after his death. So upon my supposall that he died between the thirteenth yeare of Christ and the twentie ninth, Joseph might very well be one of those who were raised at that time) and with him (perhaps) divers, whom Christ had healed, or to whom he had preached (if they died before) and many others, with whom Christ conversed till he was thirty yeares old.

[a] *Ad annum Christi* 12.

See Salianus in his Annals *in annum mundi* 4065, at large on this point.

4. And all these did prove and confirm unto the incredulous or wavering Saints, their friends or kindred, yea and to the very beleevers also, the truth of Christs doctrine, of his death, of his resurrection appearing not promiscuously to Grecians or to Romans, nor to all, no nor to all the Jews; but *to many*, but *to fit persons*, saith the Interlinearie Glosse, *whether Jews, Grecians, or Romans then residing at Jerusalem*, to such as knew them in their lives, and in their deaths. This conjecture may passe the more plausibly, if we consider that Christ himself appeared not to all indifferently, but onely to some, and to some oftner times then to others: yet no where is said to have shewed himself to any, but onely to his followers and Disciples. And as the Apostles were confirmed by Christs holy conference; so might many other then living beleeve, or the rather beleeve the Gospel of Christ upon proof made by the new raised, in many particulars strengthning their faith. They arose, [b] *To shew that Christ was raised*, saith S. Hierom on Matth. 27. [c] *They ought to rise with Christ, that they might shew he was risen*, saith Ludolphus the Carthusian. That [d] *they ought*, savoureth of presumption. Dionysius the Carthusian hath more moderate terms: he, on the place, saith, *They did testifie that Jesus was the Christ, that he was truely risen, and had*

[b] *Ut Dominum ostenderent resurgentem.*
[c] *Cum eo debebant resurgere, ut ipsum ostenderent resurrexisse.*
[d] *Debebant.*

had destroyed hell. Hierom, *Tom. 3. fol. 50.* in his answer to the eighth question of Hedibia, thus, [c] *They appeared not to all, but to many who received our Lord risen from the dead.* And yet let me superadde (by his leave) If they had appeared to the Disciples and Apostles of Christ, who received Christ, I cannot think they would have concealed it.

5. Among my other diversions and παίγνια, or *winde-aboots*, let this be one, occasionally arising from the odde position which Estius hath, in 1. Cor. 7. 39. [f] *Aquin and Carthusian conclude rightly* (saith he) *from the Apostle, that a woman is not bound to receive her husband newly raised, nor may she enjoy him without a new contract.* What if I answer, That a woman is tied to her husband as long as he liveth? but he liveth afterward, though he had been dead: and when the Apostle speaketh of death, he speaketh of a compleat death, not susceptible in this world of another life. For he opposeth the dead man to the living: as if one could not be dead, and then living; but first living, and then dead for ever till the generall resurrection. Suppose we Lazarus was married; had not his wife been his lawfull wife, bound to him by their first agreement, even after his resurrection? I doubt it not. Yet this might be the case of some of the *many*, who were raised, especially if they died but a while before. But I confesse, the case differeth, and is more perplexed, if the partie were dead, and the dayes of mourning past; and the woman married to another. Yet even here [illegible].

O Father most gracious, O Saviour most mercifull, O holy Spirit most comfortable, I humbly begge thy grace, mercie, and comfort to be shed forth upon me in this life; that I may please thee in my vocation, and do thy will, and fulfill the businesse which thou hast appointed for me. And leave not off (I beseech thee) to guide me by thine enabling counsel here, till thou art readie to crown me with thy glorie in the life to come. Amen, Lord Jesu, Amen.

[c] *Non omnibus apparuerunt, sed multis qui resurgentem Dominum susceperunt.*

[f] *Recte ex Apostoli verbis inferunt Aquinas & Carthusianus, Non teneri mulierem ad recipiendum virum de morte resuscitatum.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

1. *The raised Saints ascended not into heaven with Christ, as is proved by Scripture, and Reason. Suarez his shallow answer. Epiphanius strengthening my former positive conjectures.*

2. *If the raised ascended bodily into heaven, the Patriarchs should not be left behinde.*

3. *The ascending bodily of the Saints into heaven, not necessarie or behooffull.*

4. *Onely Christs bodie was seen ascending.*

5. *In likelihood, Christ would have shewed the Patriarchs unto some of his Apostles.*

THat these raised Saints, who bare witnesse of Christ, setling many pendulous and doubting souls, strengthening many followers and Disciples of our Saviour, and (perhaps) converting some unbeleevers, by teaching them that their expected Messiah was now come; that he did live among them, and had died for their sinnes, and risen again for their justification; That they (I say) after this office performed, again deposited their bodies in the earth, and ascended not corporally into heaven, you may behold proved by this first reason, drawn from Scripture. For Christ is compared to the high Priest, who *alone entred the* SANCTUM SANCTORUM, Hebr. 9.7. It is true indeed, that *we enter into the Holiest by the bloud of Jesus*, Heb. 10.19. but he onely, *by a new and living way, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh, entred in once into the holy place.* His entring differing from others entring; and differing in this, That with his bodie he entred, others ascended not into heaven with him bodily. Secondly, if they had ascended into heaven, following Christ, their bodies must have been seen as well as Christs: But their bodies were not seen ascending; for the Evangelists would not have omitted a matter of such moment. Suarez denieth this, because the Evangelists do describe such things as may be seen with bodily eyes, in which regard, neither the Angels, nor the souls of Saints are reported to have accompanied him, which yet divers beleeve to have kept wing and way with him to heaven. I answer, Though Angels and the spirits of men be not specified, as not being seen, as not being to

[b] Hebr. 10.20.

[a] Hebr. 9.12.

to be seen without bodies, yet such Saints as arose with their bodies, and went into heaven with their bodies (as Suarez and others think all they who arose out of their graves did) might in likelihood be seen ascending with Christ, as well as Christs bodie. And their bodies were as subject to be seen with bodily eyes, as Christs was; yea, more visible, by how much Christs bodie was more glorified then any of the Saints, if claritie, impassibilitie, agilitie, and subtilitie do make glorified bodies to be lesse visible: all which Christ had in an eminent degree above any other. An unglorified eye can see naturally a glorified bodie: though a glorified bodie can be seen or not seen, according as it pleaseth. See the Supplement of Aquin, part 3. quest. 85. artic. 2. 3. Therefore my conclusion is firm, as his objection is impertinent. Thirdly, from Epiphanius in Ancorato, I gathered what before I onely conjectured, That such onely were raised as died a while before, who rising were known to such as then lived, that their testimonie might, by their former familiaritie, the rather be beleeved, and be void of exception; whereas if such were raised as died long before, they must first use arguments to prove that themselues had sometimes lived, and that they once died, that they were newly raised, and that they were the same persons whom they reported themselves to be.

2. Now, that these should go into eternall happinesse both of souls and bodies, and leave the Patriarchs bodies in the dust, is in judgement improbable. Therefore if it were to be proved, that those who arose out of their graves after or upon Christs Passion, did ascend into the most glorious happinesse in heaven, both of bodie and soul: as, above other men, I should think and maintain, that Adam, Seth, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and all the rest before mentioned, and others unmentioned, holy Prophets and others, were they that did arise, and were they who were partakers with Christ of perfect immortalitie, and had more favours and priviledges then other men: So since Epiphanius concludeth, That others of later times were raised; I will be bold to inferre, that others ascended not into heaven before those holy Patriarchs, but laid their bodies in the graves again.

3. Again, if the end of their resurrection who now arose, was to testifie that Christ was risen; this dutie they might fulfill, though they ascended not into heaven with him. If to testifie that Jesus was *the Christ*, that he was *just*, that he was *the Sonne of God* (which was the collection of the Centurion, when he saw the graves open, and that many bodies arose, Matth. 27. 54.) their ascension into heaven was not necessary to that certificate. If they say, They arose to be witnesses of his ascension into heaven: I answer, He had

many

other witneſſes of it, Act. 1. 9. who would have been witneſſes of their aſcenſion alſo, if they had aſcended with him. If you ſay, they aroſe to be companions of his aſcenſion; I reply, that you do but beg the queſtion, and hold a groundleſſe concluſion.

4. Moreover, *Chriſt was ſeen of the Apoſtles fourtie dayes, and ſpake of things pertaining to the Kingdome of God*, Act. 1. 3. and *He ſhewed himſelf alive after his Paſſion, by many infallible proofs*, as is ſaid immediately before: and they ſaw, when he aſcended into heaven, verſ. 9. But that Chriſt ever converſed with any of thoſe that were raiſed; or was ſeen with them; or they with him; or they with the Apoſtles, or Diſciples; or that any aſcended into heaven, is no direct mention; as perhaps there would, if Adam and the reſt of the holy Patriarchs and Prophets had been raiſed, and had gone into heaven.

5. Neither would Chriſt, who vouchſafed Peter, James, and John, to ſee him conferre with Moſes and Elias at the Transfiguration, have now denied Peter, James, and John, to ſee him conferre with the ſame Moſes and other Patriarchs after his reſurrection, if they had aroſe and conferred with him, as out of doubt, during the time of fourtie dayes that he converſed on earth, ſince their and his reſurrection (if they aroſe) he often diſcourſed with them: for he did but about twelve times appeare to the Apoſtles, and that moſt on the Sabbath-dayes and then ſtayed not very long with them: and ſo I may probably think that he did imploy ſome part of the reſt of the time from his reſurrection to his aſcenſion, in conference with Moſes and the Patriarchs raiſed; eſpecially if they were to aſcend bodily into heaven with him. But none of theſe things are once pointed at. Therefore there is no likelihood that they were raiſed, much leſſe that they aſcended with Chriſt into heaven.

O Glorious Saviour of mankinde, who didſt aſcend bodily into heaven, to prepare a place for us amongſt thoſe many manſions filled with bliſſe, Open the gate to me who do knock, bid me enter into my maſters joy; that I may praiſe thy name, and wait on thee my onely ſtay, my delight, and the life of my ſoul, my Lord and Redeemer Jeſus Chriſt. So be it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

1. *Angels taken for men. Angels repreſenting men, are called men.*

2. The name JEHOVAH aſcribed to an Angel repreſenting JEHOVAH, *ſay Eſtius and Thyræus. Picking of faults in the Apocryphall Scriptures, to be abhorred.*

3. *Druſius his poverti. The Apocrypha is too little eſteemed. The Angel, who guided young Tobie, defended.*

4. *The great difference between Chriſts manner of riſing, and Lazarus his.*

INdeed it is ſaid, Act. 1. 10. Ἰδοὺ, ἄνδρες δύο, &c. *Behold, two men ſtood by them in white apparel*, whiles the Apoſtles were looking ſtedfaſtly into heaven after Chriſt, and they told them of his coming to the laſt judgement in the ſame manner as he aſcended. Which two, certainly, might be men, and *were men*, ſaith the Text, yea (ſay ſome Expoſitors) *were ſome of thoſe Many, who aroſe out of their graves after Chriſts reſurrection.* Theſe were *amicti veſtibus albis*, ſaith Eraſmus: *In albo veſtitu*, ſaith Beza: Now the Saints are *arayed in white robes*, Revel. 7. 13. and whiteneſſe of garments is a token of joy, Eccleſiaſtes 9. 7, 8. and theſe had cauſe to joy. I firſt anſwer, with moſt of the Ancients, with the modern Beza, Sa, Montanus, and Sanctius, That theſe two men, ſo called, were Angels. For the Angels repreſenting mens perſons, are called according to their names or titles whom they repreſent. As in the viſion which S. Paul ſaw by night, Act. 16. 9. it is ſaid, Ἀνήρ τις ἦν Μακεδών, *There ſtood a man of Macedonia, &c.* Now cleare it is, this was not a Macedonian indeed, but an Angel bearing his perſon, in the ſhape of man calling him with the call of God: and what is ſaid in truth of ſtorie, Joh. 20. 12. *Marie ſeeth two Angels in white, ſitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the bodie of Jeſus had layen*, is ſaid by repreſentation, Luk. 24. 4. *Two men ſtood by them in ſhining garments*; they took on them the ſhapes of two men, and ſtood in their places.

2. *If Angels repreſent the perſon of God, and do things, or ſay things as from him, and as for himſelf; they are called Gods, and the very name of JEHOVA is attributed to them: as the Angel appearing in the fierie buſh to Moſes; and other Angels*, ſaith [a] Thyræus, and [b] Eſtius. In the New Teſtament, another Angel

[a] *De locis infeſtis, part. 1. cap 23.*
[b] *Sentent. 2. Diſtinct. 8. Paragr. 8.*

gel is called *Alpha and Omega*, Revel. 22.13. which were blasphemie for any Angel to say or usurp, if the Representer might not be styled according to the dignitie of the Represented. Which note I have the rather insisted upon, to lash the rash censure of such, who, under pretence to keep the Canonicall Scripture at a great distance from the Apocryphall, pick unnecessarie faults in the Apocryphall; such faults, and so small, as a man not prepossessed could not see, and a naturall rationall Philosopher would esteem but little, in comparison of greater doubts in semblance, arising from our undoubted Canonicall. S. Hierom was the first that styled them *Apocrypha*, who never left any thing objected against him unanswered: yet being therefore taxed by Ruffinus, that therein he had robbed the holy Ghost of his treasure, he made no reply. Thus some have been hurt with kissing, and the tenderness of the ape killeth those young ones whom she loveth best. And whilest they play the Criticks in censuring the Apocrypha, they breed irreverence and irreligion toward the Canonicall, by how much the doubts seem more, or greater; *seem*, but *are not*.

3. The most painfull and learned John Drusius, in his epistle to Joseph Scaliger, before his Commentarie on the first book of the Maccabees, intimateth his fear of want, even of things necessarie; and, in the very end of his castigations on Ecclesiasticus, prayeth to God to stirre up the hearts of the Great ones and illustrious Lords to help him (may heaven and earth take notice, how miserable the estate of the learned is; when tithes the fixed honourary of the Priesthood by Divine right, are usurped by the Laicks; and reward is measured not by true worth, or by the measure of the Sanctuarie, which was full, running over, and double to the common and profane measures, but by the ignorant estimate of higgardly mechanicks, their under agents:) yet he brake through all difficulties, and hath bestowed great pains in his notes on both these books. Scaliger, *de emendat. tempor. lib.* 5. saith, The first book of the Maccabees is [c] *An excellent work*. Again, [d] *You knew long since full well the great worth of this book*, saith he, in his epistle to Drusius. And Albericus Gentilis most exquisitely disputeth in defence of the first book of Maccabees (so little regarded in these times) and answereth every objection which is brought against it. I could say more in defence of other books Apocryphall; but I recall my self to handle that particular which caused this diversion. How many wide mouths have been made? how many scandalls taken? how many aspersions of horrible untruth and lying have been fastened on that blessed Angel who guided Tobias the younger in his long and dangerous journey, because he said, (though he gave old Tobit a nick, for that he would enquire his name,

[c] *Opus eximium.*
[d] *Tu praestantiam hujus libri jamdudum scis.*

immediately after) Tob. 5. 12. *I am Azarias, the sonne of Ananias the Great, and of thy brethren*, whereas you may expound the words by this rule, That he who sustains another's person, may call himself, or be called according as the person himself. As the Angel, who appeared to S. John, Rev. 22. 9. saying, *I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the Prophets*; and, perhaps, took one of their shapes at that time. Likewise in the undoubted Canonicall, the Angel Gabriel is called *The man Gabriel*, Dan. 9. 21. because he appeared in the similitude of a man. Thus may the place of Tobit be expounded: and, without such favourable interpretations, *Familiaris & quotidianus sermo non cohærebit*, saith Cicero, *Pro A. Cæcinna*. Secondly, you may expound the words thus, I AM AZARIAS, that is, *the help of God*: THE SONNE OF ANANIAS THE GREAT; Now ANANIAS signifieth *the grace*, or *the gift of God*. And this is verified by the actions of the Angel, who helped indeed both the Tobiahs, by the especiall *grace of God*. Adde to this, that the Angels true name was *Raphael*, Tob. 12. 15. which is by signification, *the medicine*, or *physick of God*: as indeed he did make whole young Tobie his wife, and healed also old Tobie, Tob. 12. 3. All which being laid together, remove all inconvenience from the words, if we say, The Angel by those names of men, *Azarias* and *Ananias*, did signifie, that the help which was to come from him to them, came to him from God. For even this way draweth nigh unto that *Lexicall exposition*, as [d] Sixtus Senensis phraseth it, which I will not wholly exclude.

[d] *Bibliotheca sanct.* 3.

Secondly I answer, If these were no Angels, but very men; and these some of those *Many* who arose out of their sepulchres: yet cleare it is, they ascended not with Christ, nor ascended they at all, for ought that can be gathered, but upon the performance of this their last errand, their bodies might again embrace the dust.

4. Lastly, this may have a place of a probable argument: As Elias, when he was rapt into heaven in a fiery chariot, by a whirlwinde, (being even therein a type of the resurrection) let fall his mantle from him, 2. King. 2. 13. perchance as a token that he needed it no more: so Christ, when he raised himself, left his grave-linen in the grave, the linen clothes by themselves, the napkin that was about his head wrapped together in a place by it self, John 20. 7. out of doubt, to shew that death should have no more dominion over him. In which regard also he arose, the tombe being shut, and the tombe-stone sealed, and observed narrowly with a watch: for the removing of the tombe-stone by the Angel, was not to help Christ to arise, who entred in to his disciples, *ianuis clausis*, *the doores being shut*, and came forth

of

of the grave, *sepulchra signata, the monument being sealed*; but that the women might go in, and see that Christ was before raised, Mark 16. 3. &c. (and *the stone was not rolled away propter Christum, sed propter mulieres, for Christ, but for the women*, saith Hierom *ad Hedibiam*) whereas contrarily, when Lazarus was raised, the tombe-stone was first removed, and Lazarus arose, tied with the grave-clothes; and *his face bound with a napkin:* yea, *came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes*, Joh. 11. 44. by a new miracle, walking being bound, and bound with grave-clothes; to shew, that though he did live, he did live to die again. In which respect also, perhaps, the graves were opened at Christs passion, when he yeelded up the ghost; and continued open till his resurrection (yea, till the ends of their rising were fulfilled:) and after his resurrection, *many bodies of Saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves*, Matth. 27. 52, 53.

O Blessed Lord God, who hast commanded that we shall not adde to thy Word, nor yet take from it, Grant (I beseech thee) that I may neither think thy certain true Scriptures to be doubtfull, nor the uncertain to be Canonicall: but possesse me with awfull and reverent thoughts concerning thy holy writ, that I adoring the fulnesse thereof, may avoid all hastie, supine, forced, and uncharitable expositions, and fetch my little light, and candle of knowledge, from that first shine, and prime rayes of thee the onely Light, my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

CHAP. XVII.

1. *The place of Matth. 27. 53. is diversly pointed; and, according to the pointing, is the diversitie of meaning. The first implieth, that the Saints arose with Christ, though their graves were opened before. This interpretation is not so likely, though received generally.*

2. *The second inferreth, that they arose before Christ, though they went not into the citie, till after his resurrection. This is favoured by the Syriack, and is more agreeable to reason.*

3. *That the raised Saints died again, proved by reasons, and Hebr. 11. 40.*

4. *Christ the first-fruits of the dead, and of the raised. Angelicall assumed bodies were seen and heard, much rather should mens bodies ascending with Christ.*

5. *S. Augustine, Aquinas, Hierom, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius, Prosper, Soto, Salmeron, Barradius, Pererius, Valentian, affirm that the raised Saints died again. Franciscus Lucas Brugensis holds it likely.*

THose last cited words of Matth. 27. 53. being differently pointed, will bear a double and different interpretation. Our late Translation hath it thus, *The Saints came out of the graves after his resurrection,* (there is one pause) *and went into the holy citie,* (there is another pause:) so is it in the Vulgat, and in most Greek copies. This sense in those words is involved, That the Saints arose not till Christ arose, and that their resurrection was a little after, or almost contemporary with Christs: which also is evidently foretold, Isaiah 26. 19. (if the prophet prophesieth there of Christ, or speaketh in Christs person) *Thy dead men shall live; together with my dead bodie shall they arise, &c.* For Christs bodie ariseth not from the earth at the generall resurrection, and therefore they punctually signe out the resurrection of other Saints with Christ, and with his dead bodie. But if Isaiah speaketh of his own resurrection, and not of Christs; nor in Christs person, but in his own: by these words and the words following he pointeth out the generall resurrection: and so Vatablus, Hierom and Lyra expound the place. Now, if he point at the last day of the world, the argument is demonstrative, that either Isaiah arose not with Christ (though he was the most Evangelicall Prophet, and in no likelihood to be secluded from those benefits, which other Prophets are said to enjoy:) or if he arose, that he died again to rise with others at the day of judgement, which they who ascended bodily into heaven, did not: Therefore Isaiah is not bodily ascended into heaven; and if not he, why others?

2. The second way of pointing that place of S. Matthew, is this; *Many bodies of the Saints arose,* (there is one Colon) καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν *and coming out of the graves after his resurrection went into the holy citie.* there is the full period, and no other points of the words. And thus it is read in the edition printed at Geneva by John Vignon, 1615. and illustrated with Casaubon his notes: but I take it, that a pause should be immediately

* Et egressi sunt, & post resurrectionem ejus ingressi sunt in urbem sanctam.

of the Old Testament; and of the *sola anima, the sole of her foot for the wounde*; yet you shall finde Revel. 6. 11. that in regard even of *sola corporis, the glorious garment of the body*, the Saints themselves are commanded to rest yet for a little season, untill their fellow-servants also, and their brethren (which then alive, or perchance not then born) *that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled.*

Now against this generall rule you must not make a particular exception, without expresse warrant from the word of God: But there is no testimony at all from the word of God, either direct or inferentiall, that any of those many who arose, arose to glorie or immortalitie, or ascended into heaven. Therefore we may boldly conclude, They died again. This argument is of such force, that Suarez leaveth it unanswered, and untouched. Lastly, if the bodies of these Saints ascended into heaven; either they ascended after Christ, or before him, or with him. If after him, When and how long after? and why after him? They ascended not presently after him: for the Apostles who looked stedfastly toward heaven, even after he was taken out of their sight, might have then perceived their bodily ascent. If you say, So soon as the Apostles left their serious viewing, and hearkened unto the Angels, then they ascended: I answer, I would say so also, if I saw any proof, or if I could think that God sent the Angels just at that moment, to hinder the Apostles from seeing the Saints mount up to heaven, which would have been so joyous a sight. Briefly, there is no reason to say they ascended long after Christ ascended; and certainly lesse reason is there to think they ascended before him.

4. Moreover, Christ as man shall be Judge at the last day; and God hath given assurance of it to all men, *in that he hath raised him from the dead*, Act. 17. 31. If any other were raised up in the same manner before him, or with him, to an eternall resurrection, what assurance doth God give by this place of S. Paul, that Christ shall be the Judge, rather then others? But indeed the raising of Christ was more then ordinary, was more then temporarie: Let him have the preeminence in all things: *Christ is the first-fruits of them that slept*, 1. Cor. 15. 20. *The first-fruits of them that are raised*, vers. 23. He is *Primitiæ mortuorum*, Revel. 1. 5. & *resurgentium*, Act. 26. 23. Christ is the first who shall arise from the dead, *viz.* to an eternall resurrection: his bodie opening, as it were, the gates of heaven for our bodies, which if Enoch and Elias did by priviledge especiall anticipate (though these were not properly raised, but rather taken up;) yet, if more, if so many should before him arise to an everlasting resurrection, it destroyeth the nature of a generall rule. [b] *Grace given alike to all, is no longer*

[b] *Gratia quæ omnibus datur, non est gratia, sed natura; & privilegium gaudet paucitate.*

grace but nature, and a priviledge it properly confined to a few. That they ascended not with Christ, I proved before: and for 2 Corollarie do repeat this, That if assumed and Angelicall bodies cease to be seen, and were seen and heard at Christs ascension; out of doubt the bodies of Saints had been visible, yea seen, if they had then ascended.

5. If any desire to see more reasons, let him reade S. Augustine, *Epist. 99. ad Euodium, & de Mirabilibus Sacræ Scripturæ*; whose reasons [c] Aquinas preferreth, and subscribeth unto.

[c] *In tertia parte Summæ, quæst. 53. artic. 3.*

You may now perceive that I am gently fallen upon the second head; in vertue of which I undertook to prove, That the Saints, who miraculously arose, and here arose, did not ascend into heaven, but died again: for the second head, was Authoritie. Among Authours you have alreadie two of the chiefest for depth of learning, Augustine and Aquinas. Hierom is of their minde, on Matth. 27. Chrysostom, Hom. 89. on Matth. compareth those Saints resurrection unto Lazarus his rising to a mortall life, though Beza directly contradicteth it. The same Hierom, *Epist. 150. ad Hedibiam*, again confirms it. To the same purpose, Theophylact on the place, and Euthymius, chap. 67. on Matth. so Prosper in his book *de promissionibus & prædictionibus Dei*. In the middle, school, you have Soto, *in 4. lib. Sentent. Distinct. 43. quæst. 2. artic. 1.* Yea, even among Jesuites, Salmeron and Barradius are on this side; and Pererius on the 6 chapter of the Revelation, Dispat. 24. and Gregorie Valentian, *Tom. 4. Disput. 2. Quæst. 3.* where he sleighteth Cajetans arguments, and saith that ours is the more probable opinion, and that Aquin. from Augustine, doth most excellently confirm it. In the last place cometh that learned Franciscus Lucas Brugensis, who having set down the ends why these *Many* were raised (to wit, To be *præcones*, *criers*, or *trumpeters* of Christs resurrection, which was experimentally evidenced by their own; and that Jesus was that Saviour, and that he ought thus to suffer, and thus to enter into his glorie) closeth in these words, [d] *When they had performed this duty, it is likely that they slept again, and rested in their sepulchres like Moses.* Yea, say I, much rather did they sleep in their graves, then Moses: for though he was buried, yet being raised, he appeared in glorie, Luk. 9. 31. which apparition being in bodie principally (for his soul was not seen), we may not imagine, that a glorified bodie is so subject to corruption, or a second dying: which Brugensis himself will not say of these raised *Many*; for he hath an odde crotchet, and singular conceit, That those *Many* were raised, neither to an immortall, nor to a mortall life; but to a middle and mean betwixt both; not to a perpetuall one, nor yet to a temporall life; but heavenly, without the use of meats or drinks, without fear or pain of death.

[d] *Hoc officio quando isti defuncti fuerant, verisimile est eos iterum dormivisse, & in sepulchris suis quievisse, quemadmodum Moses.*

O Fountain of mercie inexhaustible, sweet Jesu, who being the Sonne of God, didst become Man, that we the sonnes of Men, might be the sonnes of God; who didst disdaine not to live suffering for our sinnes, and dying again for our justification; shew mercie, O, have mercie upon me, passe by my transgressions, I beseech thee, and prostrate and blushefast to the Throne of Grace, for thine own merits sake, to which I ascribe all power, and from which I expect all my glorie. So be it.

CHAP. XVIII.

1. *The arguments of the contrary opinion answered, Suarez, and especially Cajetan, confuted.*

2. *That by the holy Citie, Jerusalem below, Rev. meant, proved at large. Josephus and the Jews erring about the name of Jerusalem. Hieron answered.*

3. *How the raised appeared. A difference between appearing as men, and appearing as newly raised men. Bonaventure, Lucas Brugensis rejected.*

4. *An argument of Maldonat answered by the prodigious Legend of Christina, who died twice. Whether it be meet, God will send his soul from an heavenly place, to live a while on earth again.*

5. *No harm to die twice. The difference between death compleat and incompleat.*

6. *God can dispense with his own Laws.*

THus having beaten down the opposite authorities (if they were fully on that side) with weight and number; the third and last point, which I propounded to handle, was the answering of all their reasons and arguments. Some are so weak, that I need not to answer. For Suarez himself, who alledgeth them, confesseth their weaknesse, and answereth them. These three proofs following he alledgeth, but answereth not. First, *It was decent and behovefull, Decuit* (saith Suarez) *that Christ, who had both soule and flesh, should have companions of his glory, in their bodies as well as in*

their soules: For his delights is to be with the children of men, Proverb. 8. 31. Which Suarez (it may be) took as an hint from Cajetan: for he, on Aquin. *parte prima, quæst.* 33. *art.* 3. hath it thus, *It standeth with reason, that they were perfectly to a life fully immortall, that the bodily blessednesse of Christ might have some fellows: For the bodily happinesse seems not perfect and compleat, if bodily societie and company be wanting: for man is, according to the corporeall life, a sociable creature, or good fellow; not onely for want of necessaries unto life, as happeneth in this world, but for naturall delight, consisting in bodily conversation*, saith Cajetan, differing in this from the great Summist his master. I answer, that Cajetans argument is ridiculous: for it holdeth chiefly in children, or babies, in fools and in striplings, who love play-mates; or in worldly sectours, whom businesse forceth into societie and commerce. But that the Saints in heaven, yea Christ himself, the all blessed Saviour of the world, both God and Man, should not have the full of delight, or have too little of bodily felicity, if other humane bodies be not present, savoureth rather of the Turkish Coran and the Arabian schoole, then of the sacred Text: and that Christ in heaven, is *animal sociale*, naturally delighting in bodily conversation (for so much the application of that Axiom importeth, or els he saith nothing to the purpose) doth imply his brutish conceit of our most holy Redeemer. The sweet singer of Israel saith, Psal. 16. 11. *in thy presence is fulnesse of joy, at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore.* If this befall other holy Saints, much more it belongeth to Christ, from whose fulnesse all the whole bodie of his Church receiveth comfortable influences. But grant we, that such bodily companie might be desired by Christ; yet he needeth not these *Many*; but he might have had Enoch and Elias, or Moses and Elias, with whom he conferred at his transfiguration.

Secondly, unto Suarez his words Barradas his fellow-Jesuite answereth, Christ needeth not men indued with bodies now in heaven. As for the place of the Proverbs, the precedent words give light unto them, *I rejoyced in the habitable parts of the earth*, saith the Text. So his delights were with the sonnes of men, in and upon the earth: but of his delight in them with their humane bodies in heaven before the last resurrection, there is no inkling or intimation given. Suarez argueth thus secondly, *It is very unmeet, that a glorified soul to be united unto an immortall and glorious bodie: But their souls were glorious: Therefore their bodies life, and the glorie of a blessed soule, of its own nature, redoundeth upon the bodie.* I answer, It doth so redound, if it be not hindered. But the

a *Rationale videtur, quòd surrexerint perfectè ad vitam penitus immortalem, ut beatitudo corporis in Christo haberet socios: minus enim corporalis felicitas aliquid haberè videretur, si desit corporalis societas: est enim homo secundùm vitam corpoream animal sociale, &c.*

b *Anima gloriosa connaturale est, &c.*

the blessed souls of these *Many Saints* were in bodies, not immortall, not blessed, not glorious, for a few dayes or houres, and that *by miracle*, saith Barradius.

Besides, whilest Christ lived on earth, unlesse at his Transfiguration, or some such especiall occasion, the glorie of his most happie soul, which was then beatified as much as any of the souls of the Saints are now, and more, did not impart visible glorie to his bodie: but it was passible and mortall, for it died. Then why may not these Saints have the glorious light of their souls eclipsed from their bodies?

Again, the assumed bodies of blessed Angels ever did resolve into their first principles, when the ends why they assumed them, were fulfilled: the like might be in the Saints, whose souls were hindered from communicating incorruptible and glorious qualities to their bodies; and so they were partakers not of the perfection of the last eternall resurrection, but of the imperfections incident to the temporarie and mortall resurrection.

Thirdly, saith Suarez, *Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, are in hell with their bodies: therefore some, to shew Gods mercie, must now be in heaven with their bodies: and therefore these Many.* I answer, that both the sequences are lame, though we should grant the ground or antecedent of the Argument. For first, was not Gods mercie seen in heaven, from the houre of Corah and his companies descent into hell, till these *Many* ascended? Then why may it not still be seen, though these ascended not? especially, since that Christ is there in a most blessed incorruptible bodie, as they are in hell in cursed bodies, which would take corruption for a favour. Lastly, why must these *Many Saints* be the counter-pattern in heaven, rather then Enoch, or Elias, or Moses, being the Magistrate against whom Corah and his complices combined themselves?

2. Others there are who object, *It is said,* THEY ENTRED INTO THE HOLY CITIE: *But the holy citie is the new Jerusalem, Jerusalem above, Revel.* 21. 2. *Therefore they died not, but went into heaven.* I answer, Jerusalem below, the materiall Jerusalem, the seat of the kings of Judah, because of Gods worship there especially to be performed in that glorious Temple, was also called *the holy citie.* GLORIOUS THINGS ARE SPOKEN OF THEE, THOU CITIE OF GOD, Psal. 87. 3. Amongst others, thou art styled *holy.* Rev. 11. 2. *The holy citie shall the Gentiles tread under foot:* but the Gentiles shall never trample on the new Jerusalem above. On the one side of a shekel of the Sanctuarie, which once I saw, was stamped in Hebrew characters, *Holy Jerusalem.* Again, Tobit. 13. 9. *O Jerusalem, the holy citie, he will scourge thee:* but he will never scourge Jerusalem above, which is the Mother

of

of us all: therefore Jeruſalem below muſt needs be this *holy Citie*.

Bellarmine himſelf, *de Pontifice Romano*, 3. 13. accordeth with us, and interpreteth the ſtrife of the two Witneſſes againſt Antichriſt, in Jeruſalem below. And before him, Hierom in his anſwer to the eighth queſtion of Hedibia, *Tom.* 3. *fol.* 50. ſaith, *of theſe words*, THE SAINTS ENTERED INTO THE HOLY CITIE, *we muſt take* THE HOLY CITIE *to be Jeruſalem, to diſtinguiſh that citie from other cities, all which did then give themſelves to Idolatrie*: applying it to the materiall Jeruſalem, *which* (ſaith he) *from the time of Veſpaſian and Titus, was no more called* THE HOLY CITIE.

Moreover, Paula and Euſtochium, or rather Hierom in their names, *ad Marcellam, Tom.* 1. *fol.* 56. citing the place of *Mary Salmeron*, adde ſeriouſly; *You muſt not preſently underſtand the celeſtiall Jeruſalem, as moſt have ridiculouſly interpreted this place, when it could be no ſigne nor token among men on earth, if the bodies of the Saints were ſeen in the heavenly Jeruſalem.*

May I annex to this, That, if the whole land of Jurie be to this day called *The holy Land*, not will have other eſtimate of divers Nations, in ſome regards, till the worlds end: then certainly the Metropolitick all cities thereof, the famous and eminent Jeruſalem, might in thoſe dayes be dignified with the title of *the holy citie*, for many juſt regardable cauſes.

Again, when it is ſaid, Act. 6. 13. *This man ceaſeth not to ſpeak blaſphemous words againſt this holy place*; they that ſaid ſo, were not in the *Temple*, but in their *Councel-houſe* in *the citie*: and the words have a mere reference to the *citie*, as well as to the *Temple*, yea more, becauſe the Temple was within the citie, and not *e contrà*. Now their Councel-houſe was diſtant a good way from any part of the Temple, and was built cloſe by one wall of the citie; and was called GAZITH in Hebrew, wherein ſeventie Senatours, or ordinarie Judges, called SANHEDRIM, determined weighty cauſes: and here they examined the Apoſtles, Acts 4. 7. and S. Stephen, Act. 6. 13. and 7. 1.

The citie which before was called *Solyma*, was by Melchizedech named *Hieroſolyma*, that is, *The holy Solyma*, ſaith Joſephus, *de bello Judaico*. 7. 18. Let Joſephus juſtifie upon what grounds he mongrelleth the name: for, neither did Melchizedech ſpeak Greek, nor doth the Hebrew incline to that ſenſe: yet is even that hotch-potch better to be digeſted, then the impious and ſottiſh fable of other Jews, That Melchizedech having named the citie *Salem*, and Abraham having called the mount Moriah in or about Jeruſalem, JEHOVA JIREH, *The Lord will ſee*, or *provide*, Geneſ. 22. 14: God him-

b *Ad diſtinctionem omnium civitatum, quæ tunc idolis ſervebant.*

c *Nec ſtatim Hieroſolyma cæleſtis, ſicut pleriquè ridiculè interpretantur, in hoc loco intelligitur: cùm ſignum nullum eſſe poterit apud homines, ſi corpora Sanctorum in cæleſti Jeruſalem viſa ſunt.*

himself being unwilling to suffer a debate between the holy Melchizedech and Abraham the father of the faithfull, umpired the businesse, and of both their attributes, or appellations, compounded one word, or name, and calleth it thereafter, *Hierusalem*.

Perhaps, S. Hierom can hardly prove what he saith in his epistle to Dardanus, *de Terra promissionis Tom.* 3. 24. that the citie was first called *Jebus*; and thence from *Jerusalem*, rather then *Jebusalem*, *Euphoniæ gratiâ*; *that it might have a fair sound, and good pronunciation.* For there is mention of Jerusalem, Judg. 1. 8. yea before that, Josh. 10. 1. long before David expelled the Jebusites: and in the dayes of Melchizedech, it was called *Salem*: for Melchizedech was *King of Salem*, Hebr. 7. 1. Now that the Jebusites inhabited Jerusalem before the time of Melchizedech, or that he should be King of the Jebusites inhabiting that place, or that he should expell the Jebusites there commorant before him, or how they repossessed it till Davids time; or indeed that the name was given as S. Hierom opineth, are matters onely of conjecture, as not being backt with proofs sufficient.

Lastly, if we be led with reason, as I said before, What should be the end of these Saints ascending to heaven? Christ had no need of bodily service; and we may not think that they were to bear witnesse in heaven of Christs resurrection: for the triumphant Saints need no such proofs, or witnesses; their beatificall vision and fruition exempteth them from doubting. The living had more need to know by these *Many*, the resurrection of Christ: but by them the living knew nothing at all, so farre as can be proved; if this going into the holy citie be to be interpreted of the supernall Jerusalem. But that the words are to be expounded of Jerusalem below, the passage immediately following demonstrateth; *They went into the holy citie, and appeared unto many.* Certainly, if they had gone into heaven, they must have appeared unto *all* there: for as [d] *No corner of heaven is hid from any*; so there all things present are seen face to face; their matutine knowledge infinitely surpasseth our vespertine, all and every one see all and every one present.

[d] *Cœlum est singulis totum, omnibus unum.*

3. Yet even from these very words, *They appeared unto many*, Maldonat gathereth, that they did not appeare commonly, or indifferently, or generally to all: from whence he inferreth, *If they arose to die again, they would have appeared not to many, as the Evangelist said they did, but vulgò omnibus, promiscuously to all.* I answer; They appeared to all; *viz.* All that met them, saw them, and saw them as *men*, and as *other men*; but not as *newly raised men*; for so onely they appeared to *Many*; as Christ himself did appeare *Testibus præordinatis à Deo*

Dei, unto witnesses chosen before of God, Act. 10. 41. so did they, to such onely as God had appointed.

To evince this distinction, let it be considered, whether every one who saw Lazarus after his resurrection, saw him as a raised man, or as an ordinary man. But if Lazarus might appeare commonly to all men, and yet appeare unto *Many* onely, as a man raised lately from the dead, these Saints also might be seen, and were seen of all that passed by and looked on them (*apparuerunt vulgò omnibus, they appeared ordinarily to all*,) and yet they might be seen not by all, but onely appeare to *Many*, as persons raised of purpose for holy ends. And this opinion I hold to be more probable then that of Franciscus Lucas Brugensis on the place, That onely unto some the raised did *aliquando apparere, aliquando disparere, sicut Jesus, Sometime appeare to some, and sometimes vanish, as our Saviour did.* I answer, he had said somewhat, if the resurrection had been of the same nature with Jesus his resurrection. And as I dislike him not, if by *disparere* he meaneth that they did not alwayes converse with the same men, but changed company: so if by it he understandeth a sudden vanishing from the sight of men, and implyeth that the *Many* raised had a power to be visible and invisible at their pleasure; till he bring proof to evince it, he shall give me leave to parallel it to the fiction of Gyges and his ring: whose broad bezill, or inseating part, if he turned to the palm of his hand, he was forthwith invisible; yet himself saw all things, but if he turned it to the back side of his hand, he was as conspicuous as an other man. So Cicero in the third book of his offices, out of Plato.

The same Maldonat presseth us sore with an other argument: *What should they do here, living again in mortall bodies, who had taste of Gods glorie? surely they had been in worse condition, then if they never had been raised out of the bosome of Abraham, where they were quiet, to come to a turbulent life again.* Because this Maldonat is an importunate snarler at our religion, I give him this bone to gnaw upon: and for my first answer, I will call to minde the prodigious Legend, which divers eminent men of their own side have recorded of one Christina, called by them, by way of eminency, *Wonderfull*. To omit what Surius and others relate, I will speak in the words of Dionysius the Carthusian: *Christina died young, — and was carried into paradise to the throne of the Divine majesty — and she unspeakably glad, God congratulating with her. And the Lord said, Ecce, this is my dearest daughter.* And then he telleth, That God gave her choice, either to stay with him, or to return unto her bodie, and by penitentiall works to satisfie for all the soules in purgatorie, and to edi-

* *Mirabilis — Cùm defuncta esset in pueritia, — ducta erat in paradisum, ad Thronum Majestatis Divinæ — Dominus congratulante, ineffabiliter gavisa est: Dixitque Dominus, Revera, hæc charissima filia est.*

[b] *Cum meritorum augmento.*

ſie thoſe who lived, and to return to God, [b] *with increaſe of her merits.* She anſwered the Lord preſently, that for that cauſe ſhe would return to her bodie: And ſo ſhe did: and becauſe ſinnefull men by their ſtench did too much afflict her, (O tender-noſed virgin!) ſhe did flie, (or the Papiſts did lie) and ſit on the top-boughes of trees, pinacles, or turrets; (ſince noiſome ſmells aſcend, it had been her farre better courſe, to have crept into ſome dennes, and caverns of the earth, or vaults and tombes, as he ſaith ſhe did ſometimes) and when her neighbours, or kindred thought her mad, and kept her from meat, ſhe prayed onee to God, and milk came out of her breaſts, (was not ſhe an intemerate rare virgin!) and ſo ſhe refreſhed herſelf. This, and a great deal more hath that Carthuſian, (holy and learned above many of their ſide) *de quatuor noviſſimis part. 3. Artic. 16.*

Let cenſorious and maledicent Maldonat ponder theſe things well; and it will ſtop his mouth for ever from barking at the belief of us, whom they ſtyle Hugonets, Calviniſts, Hereticks; though none of us think, or ſay otherwiſe, then the good Pacianus did of old, in his firſt epiſtle to Sempronius, CHRISTIAN *is my name, and* CATHOLICK *is my ſurname.* The Turks indeed have ſome ſtrange figments of this nature: but though the Mahumetan prieſts have deviſed and feigned many ſuperſtitious miracles concerning their great Sainteſſe Naſiſſa, as is confeſſed by Joannes Leo in his African hiſtorie, *lib.* 8. yet the Papiſts have ſurmounted both this and other their impoſtures, with this their mirabilarie Chriſtina.

Secondly, concerning theſe *Many* raiſed, I anſwer unto Maldonat, They continued not long in this life; but (as I gueſſe) ſhortly after Chriſts aſcenſion, laid their bodies down to ſleep again in the earth. Thirdly, what thinks Maldonat of Lazarus? Was not his ſoul in Abrahams boſome (as well as the other poore Lazarus his ſoul) who was ſo tenderly beloved of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles? and yet he lived long after: and whatſoever can be objected againſt theſe Saints, holds ſtronger againſt Lazarus. Fourthly, I denie that they by their return into the fleſh, were in worſe condition. Lorinus on Acts 9. 41. ſaith, [c] *It is no trouble to a man, if being dead he obey Gods call, and live again.* And Salmeron ſaith, No reaſon, but holy men at Gods command may put on and put off their own bodies as well, and as contentedly, as the Angels do their aſſumed bodies: which I do the rather beleeve, becauſe I do ſay with Toſtatus, on the 2. King. 4. Quæſt. 56, *Though it cannot be certainly proved, yet it is probable, That none of thoſe that ever were raiſed, did periſh everlaſtingly, nor that any reprobate had the favour of an extraordinary reſurrection for a ſeparated ſoul that had*

[c] *Non affert moleſtiam, ut Deo vocanti mortuus obtemperet reviviſcendo.*

been partaker of those unspeakable joyes, will esteem more than dung, or salt that hath lost its savour, all the pleasures and perfections of this life, though their severall excellencies were distilled into one quintessence of perfection. So that, as Lorinus saith well in the place above cited, *Whosoever hath once escaped the perill of damnation, he shall not come into the same danger again.*

5. The last objection that I have met withall is this, That to die the second time is no favour, but a punishment, and a punishment iterated. I answer, If a righteous man should die thrice, or oftner, death is no punishment unto him, yea to passe seven times through hell, to come once and everlastingly to heaven, a despairing soul would hold to be a cheap blessednesse. Secondly, Suarez himself saith, *It is no punishment to die the second time, to make short worke in order to Master, to the twelve, to Saint Augustine, to Innocent, Scripture* 3. *for, against other divines dissent from Augustine.* Nay (saith Suarez) *the last time they die the second time, is more acceptable and pleasing to God.* To this doth Peter Martyr agree in 1. King. 4. 22. *If by their loss, or losse, God be glorified, it is no injury to man.* But in truth it is no hurt, or losse to man: for, saith Barradius, *Perchance, without any pains they might redeliver their carcases to the earth:* And if the pains be any, *the pains both of the latter, and former death, may be so tempered and diminished, that they both shall not exceed the pains of one death,* saith Peter Martyr *ibid.* Which learned Peter Martyr out of S. Augustine *de Anim. & Orig. Scripture* 3. *tit.* hath an excellent observation or two. First, that to every man is fetled and appointed a prefixed time of death. Secondly, That before the last prefixed time some do die, that they that raise them to life may be more famous, and God more glorified. And this is proved by the very phrase which Christ used concerning Lazarus, John 11. 4. *This sickness is not unto death:* Yet did he die, and besides the time intercedent between his death and his buriall, he was foure dayes buried. But his sickness was not [d] *to an intire death, in which estate he should remain.* Neither is that so properly called death, [e] *when it is abortive, and cometh before its time.* So, Luke 8. 52. *She is not dead, but sleepeth;* and yet verse 55. *her spirit came again.* Therefore it was gone, and she was dead. So that we may shut up this point with this periode, and with a distinction out of Peter Martyr, from S. Augustine; Death is so termed, either *properly*, or *improperly*; *compleatly*, or *incompleatly*. If you take death *properly*, and *compleatly*, for that separation of the soul, which cannot admit an other conjunction or union with the bodie till the generall resurrection: then no man ever died but once, or

[d] *Ad mortem plenam, in qua Lazarus maneret.*

[e] *Quando præoccupat ultimum terminum.*

was come *ad plenam mortem*, to that prefixed period and last houre of life; but their former death was onely *improper, preparatorie*, and *abortive*. Now if you take death *improperly* and *incompletly*, for any manner of true separation, which indeed is the commonest acception; a man may die twice, and divers have died twice; yea, all they that ever were raised in the Old and New Testament (except our Saviour onely, who cooperated to his own resurrection) all they, and every of them, died the second time.

[f] *Paucorum prærogativa non officit legi Naturæ, ut aliquoties monet Origines.*

[g] *Singulorum privilegia legem efficere non possunt.*

[h] *Privilegium paucorum universali legi non derogat.*

[i] *Potens est Deus cum statuto communi dispensare.*

6. [f] *The priviledge of a few checketh not, offendeth not the law of nature, as Origen observeth more then once*, saith Erasmus on the 1. Thessal. 4. or in Hieroms phrase, [g] *The prerogatives of singular men establish not a Law*: or, in the way of Augustine, [h] *The priviledge of a few doth not derogate from the generall law.* Though it be *ordinarily* appointed for all men once to die, yet *extraordinarily*, some may not die at all, and some must die twice. For, [i] *God may and can dispense with a common statute of his own*, saith Holcot, on Wisdome the 2. His hands are free, who hath manicled the whole world by his lawes: he is not tied by Stoicall fatall necessitie, *who is Agens liberrimum, a most voluntarie free agent.*

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts, I humbly implore thy favourable protection: strengthen me, O gracious God, against all mine enemies, bodily and ghostly; and when I have by thy power fought a good fight, when I have finished my course, take me, I beseech thee, from being a member of thy Church militant, in this Jerusalem below, to be partaker of blessednesse with thy Church triumphant, in Jerusalem above, the Mother of us all: which petition I earnestly present unto thy Sacred Majestie, in the name and mediation of my onely Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

1. *Strange conceits concerning Nero, from Suetonius, Tacitus, Hierom, Augustine. Nero supposed to be Antichrist.*

2. *An other incredible relation of the Armenian, who is said to have lived at Christs passion. The Armenians have their holy frauds.*

AS I began with two or three strange histories, having some relation to the propounded questions: so I hold it not amisse, to end with two or three, which shall give some light to some other parts of this question, or at least by their strangenesse shall afford delight, though I end in a fable.

Suetonius, *in Nerone cap.* 57. toward the end, thus historifieth. [a] *There were some who for a long time did deck the tombe of Nero with flowers, both of the spring and summer: and sometimes did bring his statues and resemblances adorned with long purple imbroydered robes, unto the pleading places; now and then they would proclaim his Edicts, as if he had been alive, and would shortly return to the damage of his enemies. To conclude, After twentie yeares when I was but a youth, when there appeared on the stage an aduenturous fellow, who boasted that he was Nero; so great respect was shewed to his name and credit, that he had great helps and aids, and with much ado was delivered up.* So farre Suetonius. Tacitus also, *Histor.* 2. reports, that many did believe Nero did live long after he was dead. S. Hierom to Algasia, *de undecim quæst. quæst. ultima*, makes Nero a fore-runner of Antichrist, and he gives this sense to these words, 2 Thess. 2. 7. [b] NOW THE MYSTERIE OF INIQUITIE WORKETH. *By these many harms and sinnes*, (saith he) *by which Nero, the worst of all the Cesars, oppresseth the world, Antichrists coming is breeding and readie to come to light, and what Antichrist shall do hereafter, Nero now in part accomplisheth.* S. Augustine his relation goeth one step further, [c] *Some do suspect and imagine* (saith he) *that Nero shall rise again and be Antichrist. Others think that Nero was not slain, but was within, when they thought he was murdered; and that he lieth hid, living in the vigour of that age, wherein he was when they thought he was slain.* Which storie when I read, it recalled to my minde a more uncouth relation of an other dive-dopper. And this it is.

2. In Matthew Paris, on the eleventh yeare of Henry the third, *anno Christi* 1228. in his greater historie printed at

[a] *Non defuerunt qui per longum tempus veruis æstivisque floribus tumulum Neronis ornarunt; ac modò imagines prætextatas in rostris proferrent, modò edictà, quasi viventis, & magno inimicorum malo reversuri.—Denique, cùm post viginti annos, adolescente me, extitisset conditionis incertæ, qui se Neronem esse jactaret, tam favorabile nomen ejus apud Parthos fuit, ut vehementer adjutus, & vix redditus sit.*

[b] *Jam mysterium operatur iniquitatis: Multis malis & pessimis, quibus Nero impurissimus Cæsarum mundum premit, Antichristi parturitur adventus, &c.*

[c] *Nonnulli illum resurrecturum, & futurum Antichristum suspicantur. De Civ. Dei. lib. 20. cap.*

London, page 170. it is said, That an Arch-bishop of Armenia came into England in pilgrimage, was entertained at S. Albans Abby: Being there asked touching that Joseph, of whom there was a common speech, that he was present when Christ suffered, and spake with him, and that he yet liveth as a firm proof of the Christian faith, the Arch-bishop answered, That he knew Joseph well, and the Antiochian (who was the interpreter to the Arch-bishop) told the whole storie thus to Henry Spigurnel his acquaintance, and the Abbots servant, That before the Arch-bishop came out of Armenia, Joseph used to be at his table; that at the Passion when Christ was haled from before Pilate to the crosse, the said Joseph (then called *Cartaphilus*) being usher of the Court, did most scornfully punch Christ on the back, as he went out of the doore, and mocking said, *Go, Why stayest thou?* But Christ looking back with a stern eye and countenance on him, said, *I go, and thou shalt expect*, or *stay till I come*. And so he did. For the Sonne of Man goeth indeed, as it is written of him, and must be crucified, and die, and shall live again: but thou shalt abide, and not die, till my second coming.

It is further added, that this Cartaphilus was, at the time of Christs death, about thirty yeares old, and so often as he cometh to one hundred yeares, he is taken with a seeming incurable disease, and is as it were in an extasie: then growing better, *redit vel totus, vel mutatis annis, iuvenis*, and lives, to the state of thirty yeares. After Christs ascension was baptized by Ananias (who baptized Paul) and was called *Joseph*: he is reported to be a man of a holy life and conversation, humble and patient, and liveth in both the Armenias, among Clergymen. Thus farre Matthew Paris, who was a Monk of Saint Albans, in that time. And in the like words the storie is reported by Thomas Walsingham a Monk of Winchester, in his Chronicle, which is a manuscript as the great searcher of antiquities Mr. Selden, my very worthy friend, assured me.

If this Joseph [illegible] he hath not died wholly, but very often.

I have recounted these narrations, for the pleasantness of the matter, perhaps (I may say) curious. But as S. Augustine branded the former storie, and the beleevers of it, saying, *The great presumption of these opinionists makes me wonder*. So I will not be afraid to tax the latter as an imposture, both because of the variety of Names by which he is called, as you may finde in the learned Mr. Seldens Illustrations on Polyolbion, pag. 133. where he discovers the incredible fable of Ruth, which is cousin-german to the relation of the stern

Multum admiror de hac ostentatione tanta præsumptio.

ſtern Cartaphilus; and becauſe the Armenians, as well as the Romans, have their holy frauds: as was ſeen by our men, laught at by the Turks, and beleeved by the ſilly Laicks of Armenia, whileſt their Prieſts would ſtrive to fetch falſe fire from Chriſts ſepulchre on Eaſter even. See Mr. Sands in his third book, pag. 173.

Laſtly, if this ſtorie of the Armenian could be an undoubted truth; the Greek Church would ere this have produced him, to juſtifie the practiſe and opinions of the Eaſtern Church againſt the Weſtern, wherein they diſſented: But no ſuch thing was ever attempted: And therefore let this be caſt into the number of fables.

Soli DEO gloria.

FINIS.

MISCELLANIES OF DIVINITIE.

THE THIRD BOOK.

CHAP. I.

1. Many Papists are very peremptorie, that all and every one must die. Melchior Canus is more moderate. The words are onely indefinite, not universall.

2. Objections brought to prove, that universally all shall die. Their answers. Generall rules have exception. Even many learned Papists have acknowledged so much. The point handled, especially against Bellarmine.

3. Indefinites have not the force of universals. Even universals are restrained.

4. Salmeron bringeth many objections to prove an absolute necessitie that every one shall die. All his objections answered. Mans living in miserie is a kinde of death.

THe third question is, Whether Adam and his children, all and every one of them, without priviledge or exception, must and shall die? It ariseth also from the same fountain from which the two former questions did proceed: *It is appointed unto men to die.*

The answer consisteth of three parts: That there may be an exception of some; That some have been excepted; That others shall be excepted. And so the answer is returned with the negative, thus, *All and every one shall not die:* For though it be appointed for men to die; yet the appointment may be, hath been, and shall be reversed.

Neither fear I the saying of Aquinas, *part. 3. quæst. 78. artic. 1.* [a] *It is the more common and more safe opinion of the Divines; That every one must die.* And this opinion is maintained with stiffe and peremptory obstinacie, by our adversaries

[a] *Est communior & securior sententia Theologorum, Unumquemque mori.*

ries the Papists. Bosquier in his *Terror orbis*, Salmeron upon the 1. Thessal. 4. Gregory de Valent. with others are resolute, That none can be dispensed withall, but all mankinde, and every childe of Adam must die. But Melchior Canus is more moderate; [b] *Though it be appointed for all men to die,* (saith he) *yet that one or two out of that generall law by priviledge be exempted, is not so against Scriptures, that it may not be questioned.* And, *Locor. Theol.* 7. 3. *Numer.* 9. he proveth that it is no way against Scripture, *That the thrice-blessed mother of our Lord, may by singular priviledge be exempted,* (he had erred if he had said, *Is priviledged*) *from the universall law of all being born in sinne;* and further confirmeth it by this instance, *Because the Scriptures say in generall, Exod.* 33.20. NO MAN SHALL SEE ME AND LIVE; *and John* 1.18. NO MAN HATH SEEN GOD AT ANY TIME: *yet Moses and Paul saw God.* And though ordinarily there is no return from death to life, and the Saints come not back again from heaven to dwell on earth; yet Augustine saith, *in lib. de Cura pro mortuis, Cap.* 15. [c] *The Scripture witnesseth that some from the dead have been sent to the living, as Moses to Christ: and on the other side, Paul being living was carried into Paradise.*

[b] *Locorum Theologic. 7. 2. Num. 3.*

[c] *Mitti quoque ad vivos, aliquos ex mortuis, ut Mosem ad Christum: sicut è contrario, Paulus ex vivis in Paradisum raptus est, Divina Scriptura testatur.*

Again, I say the words of the Apostle are onely *indefinite,* not *generall:* it is not said, Ἀπόκειται πᾶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *It is appointed to all men:* but, *It is appointed unto men:* whether all, or onely some, is not here determined.

Now because this place wants its strength and nerves, to prove that point; and neither in the Greek, nor Vulgar, nor Syriack, is the universall expressed; the Jesuits have amassed up together many places of Scripture to confirm their opinion.

2. *What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death?* Psal. 89. 48. *In Adam all die,* 1. Corinth. 15. 22. *Death is the house appointed for all living,* Job 30. 23. *Death passed upon all men,* Rom. 5. 12. *He shall be brought to the grave, and remain in the tombe: The clods of the valley shall be sweet unto him, and every man shall draw after him, as there are innumerable before him,* Job 21.32. MORTE MORIERIS, *Thou shalt die the death* (Gen. 2. 17.) was threatned to Adam, and all his: and therefore God, who cannot lie, will see it accomplished.

To the last place I answer first: It is well rendred and expounded, *Mortalis eris, Obnoxius eris morti; Thou shalt be mortall, and subject to death,* as Lyra and Varablus have it. Beda on Genes. 2. *Morti deputatus eris, Thou shalt be condemned to death.* Chrysostom, on John, Homil. 27. [d] *Adam died by guilt and judgement, though execution was suspended.* And to say truth, In the midst of *life* we are in *death:* Man is dying, till he be dead. Infirmities and sickness *pursue men till they perish,* Deuteronomie 28. 22. *The wicked shall finde no ease*

[d] *Adam mortuus est, si non Re, tamen Sententiâ.*

nor

nor reſt, but ſhall have trembling hearts, fayling of eyes, and ſorrow of minde, verſe 65. *Thy life ſhall hang in doubt before thee, and thou ſhalt fear day and night, and ſhalt have no aſſurance of thy life*, verſ. 66.

To all the other alledged places of Scripture, one anſwer fitly ſerveth: *viz.* That the holy Writ ſpeaketh of the ordinary courſe of Nature, and hath no intent to limit Gods power, or to binde the Lawmaker; but he may exempt from death whomſoever he pleaſeth. For generall rules are not without exceptions. It is moſt true, what Ariſtotle, *de Hiſtor. Animal.* 7. 10. generally avoucheth, [d] *No childe crieth in the mothers wombe:* and yet extraordinarily it may be true, what Libavius *in lib. de vagitu uterino*, and Albertus Magnus *lib.* 10. *de Animalibus*, and Solinus in his third chapter, report; to wit, *Quoſdam embriones plorâſſe in utero, That ſome Embrioes have wept and cried out in their mothers wombe:* As on the contrary, what Livie *lib.* 24. recordeth; namely, *Infantem in utero matris* TO TRIUMPHALE *clamâſſe, That an infant in the mothers wombe ſang the Outcrie uſed in triumphs:* And what Appian of Alexandr. *de bellis civilibus Roman. lib.* 4. almoſt in the beginning relateth, *That a childe ſpake ſo ſoon as it was born: which was a prognoſtick of ſorrow, againſt the erection of the* TRIUMVIRI. Petrus Pomponatius, *in lib. de incantationibus, cap.* 10. goeth one ſtep further: and though it be a little out of my way, yet ſuffer me to follow him. [e] *Haly Aben-Ragel* (ſaith he) *by Aſtrologie knew and foretold that a new born childe ſhould preſently propheſie; as Conciliator relateth.* So the univerſall law of all mens dying, may ſtand in full force and vertue, and yet be abridged by ſome extraordinary exceptions, through the unlimited command of the moſt free Lawmaker. My proofs that univerſall propoſitions do not alwaies exclude ſome particular contraries, ſhall be of ſuch generall rules as are limited by the Papiſts themſelves: becauſe the controverſie now in agitation, is onely againſt them.

The great maſter of Controverſies, Bellarmine himſelf, *de Purgatorio* l. 12. ſpeaking of the taking up of the good thief into Paradiſe, ſaith, [f] *A few mens priviledges eſtabliſh not a law.*

Gerſon, that learned Chancellour of Paris, in his Sermon on the birth of the thrice bleſſed Virgin, the third part, thus ſettleth; [g] *It is apparent, that God hath not tied his mercifull ſalvation to the common laws of Chriſtian veritie: no not ſo to the Sacraments themſelves, but, without prejudice of that law, he may ſanctifie children in the wombe, with the baptiſme of his grace, or power of the holy Spirit.*

Matthias Felizius, pag. 184. acknowledgeth, that extraordinarily the ſouls of good and bad men do ſometimes come out of heaven and hell: yet are there generall ſtatutes and the ordinary courſe oppoſite and contrarie.

[d] Περὶ ἀζωίας, 3 ἀδιγγέλου τὸ παιδίον.

[e] *Haly Aben-Ragel ſcientiâ ſyderum ſcivit prædicere, puerum natum ſtatim prophetaturum, ſicut refert Conciliator.*

[f] *Privilegia paucorum legem non faciunt.*

[g] *Conſtat, Deum miſericordiam ſalvationis ſuæ non ità legibus communibus traditionis Chriſtianæ, non ità Sacramentis ipſis alligâſſe, quin, abſque præjudicio legis ejuſdem, poſſit pueros wombum natos intus ſanctificare, Gratiæ ſuæ baptiſmo, vel virtute Spiritus ſancti.*

By an argument drawn from ſpeciall priviledge, *Petrus Thyræus, de locis infeſtis, part. 1. cap. 9.* maintaineth, That humane ſouls may return out of Purgatorie, yea, out of Hell. [h] *The Law-maker* (ſaith he) *hath an eye ſtill aiming at a generall good: which generall good, if it take place and ſucceed without the law, it is no great detriment or wrong to the law.*

Cardinal Tolet, on John 1.3. [i] *Sometimes we ſpeak generally, to ſignifie a numerous multitude: though we do not mean to compriſe all and every parcell of that multitude.* 1. Cor. 9.25. *Every man that ſtriveth for the maſterie, is temperate in all things:* But neither do all abſtain, nor do they, who abſtain, abſtain from all things. Which truth in the mouth of Tolet, might be confirmed at large by the Fathers. Let S. Hierom onely give in his verdict; Hierom, *Tom. 3. Epiſt. ad Damaſum, de Prodigo*, thus, [k] *It is even a rule in Scripture, that the word ALL hath not reference to the whole* (comprehending every ſingular particular) *but to the greateſt part.* And as *OMNIS*, *All*, ſo likewiſe *NULLUS*, *None*, is reſtrained, 1. Kings 18.10. where the words *No nation or kingdome*, extend not through the whole world; but are to be reduced and confined to thoſe Nations or Kingdomes which were Achabs ſubjects or tributaries, to whom he might and could adminiſter an oath: which he did not, could not do in the dominions of other abſolute free Princes.

I muſt yet come up cloſer to Bellarmine. Gen. 7.18. *Repleverunt aquæ Omnia in ſuperficie terræ*, as it is in their Vulgat: though it be not ſo, either in the Hebrew, or Greek. And, *All the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered*, verſ. 19. Yet Bellarmine, *in lib. de Gratia primi hominis, cap. 4.* excepteth Paradiſe, which, being on earth, was not overflown.

Geneſ. 7.21. *All fleſh died, — and every man:* and verſ. 22, *All in whoſe noſtrills was the breath of life — died:* and verſ. 23. *Every living ſubſtance — both man and cattell, &c.* Yet for all theſe generalities, Bellarmine, in the place cited, excepteth Enoch, who then lived upon earth, in Paradiſe, as he imagined.

Rom. 5.12. *Death paſſed upon all, for that all have ſinned.* But, [l] *The Virgin Mary was prevented by Gods ſpeciall grace, ſo that ſhe was free from ſinne ſo ſoon as ſhe had any being*, ſaith Bellarmine, *Tom. 3. de amiſſione grat. & ſtatu peccat. 4. 16.* He exempteth her by ſpeciall priviledge from ſinne. Why may not we, by the force of his reaſon, exempt an other from death? Moreover, Enoch and Elias, at what time S. Paul wrote theſe words, were not dead, though the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of things paſt: nor are dead yet, as the Papiſts hold. Gorran on the place anſwereth appoſitely, *Death went over all, REATV, non ACTV; by way of guiltineſſe*, not *Actually*. 1. Cor.

[h] *Bonum publicum Legiſlatori ſemper propoſitum eſt: hoc ſi, lege præteritâ, obtineri poteſt, legis ratio magna non habetur.*

[i] *Aliquando ſolemus generatim loqui; ad multitudinem ſignificandam; quamvis non omnes partes multitudinis comprehendantur.*

[k] *Canon Scripturarum eſt*, Omnia *non ad totum referenda, ſed ad maximam partem.*

[l] *Præventa fuit Maria ſingulari gratiâ & privilegio Dei, ut ſimul & eſſe & juſta eſſe inciperet.*

1. Corinth. 15. 51, &c. *We ſhall all be changed at the laſt trump:* Yet Bellarmine, *de Romano Pontifice*, 3. 6. ſaith that Enoch and Elias ſhall die and riſe again before the generall reſurrection: till which time the laſt trump bloweth not: And Chriſt was riſen before, though the words be large: and not Chriſt alone, but (if Holcot be not deceived, on Wiſd. 2. 5.) = *It is an holy belief of the Church, that the bleſſed mother of Chriſt hath obtained a full and perfect reſurrection.* Which words ſuffice to croſſe other Papiſts, who denie that any exception is to be made to the generall axioms, though by us they are held as fables.

= *De Matre Chriſti benedicta, vide credit Eccleſia, quòd ſit in ea reſurrectio completa.*

3. Let us take a view of ſome indefinites, and we ſhall not finde them to be univerſally applied.

The Prophets are dead, John 8. 53. yet *Enoch was a Prophet*, Jude verſ. 14. and Elijah was chief among Prophets: Notwithſtanding, theſe were not dead. Revel. 14. 13. *The dead reſt from their labours*, yet divers have been raiſed from a true death, and have returned again into this world of labour. My very Text is fertile of more particulars to this purpoſe, *It is appointed unto men to die* ἅπαξ, SEMEL, UNO TEMPORE, as it is in the Syriack, word for word: yet ſome have died twice. *It is appointed unto men once to die, and after that cometh* JUDGEMENT: but Chriſt was not judged after he died. That he was judged in the particular judgement of ſouls, cannot be, ſince himſelf is there the Judge. So ſhall he alſo be judge in the generall judgement.

But let us return to the univerſalls. Matth. 26. 33. *Though all men ſhall be offended becauſe of thee, yet will I never be offended:* yet was he a man: and if the words there be reſtrained to all Chriſts Diſciples or Apoſtles, yet Peter accounts himſelf none of that all, and exempts himſelf from the number of them that would be ſcandalized. 1. Corinth. 15. 27. *He hath put all things under his feet: But when he ſaith all things are put under him, it is manifeſt that he is excepted which did put all things under him.* Heb. 11. 13. *Theſe All died in faith:* Yet Aquinas truely there excepteth Enoch.

Aquinas, *in* 4. *lib. Sentent. diſt.* 43. *artic.* 4. thus, *By the ſame reaſons by which we ſhewed that all ſhould ariſe from the dead, may we ſhew alſo, that all ſhall ariſe* A CINERIBUS, *in the generall reſurrection: unleſſe by eſpeciall grace the contrarie be granted to ſome, as the haſtening of the reſurrection is granted to ſome.* Where Aquinas confeſſeth that ſome are diſpenſed withall, both for incineration, that their bodies ſhould not be turned into duſt, and ſome alſo ſhall have a ſpeedier reſurrection by an eſpeciall grace. Why then, by the eſpeciall grace of the ſame God, may not ſome be freed from the ſtroke of death?

4. Salmeron tuggeth it out hard by the teeth, to uphold

that none ſhall be acquitted from death, but, without exception, all muſt die. Hearken to his reaſons.

n *If death ſpared not Chriſt and his Mother, whom will death ſpare?* I anſwer, Death ſpareth none; ſo that no one can ſay, I will not die. Death ſpareth none: but he that hath the power of death, may ſpare whom he pleaſeth. Fire and water have no mercie: yet the three children were preſerved in the fire, and S. Peter walked upon the ſea. The rivers have divided themſelves; yea, the Red ſea gathered it ſelf together, and was as a wall on the right hand and on the left, in the paſſage of the children of Iſrael toward Canaan. God, above the pitch of humane reaſon, may free whom he will from death; and ſhut up the mouth of the grave, that it ſhall not ſwallow ſome, as he did the mouthes of the lions, when he ſaved Daniel.

Again ſaith Salmeron, o *Who die not with Chriſt, or as well as Chriſt, ſhall not ariſe, nor be members of his bodie.* All the Jeſuits in the earth cannot demonſtrate that propoſition. If they uſe S. Auguſtines reaſon, p *Onely the dead ſhall ariſe: But all ſhall ariſe: Therefore all ſhall die:* I anſwer with S. Auguſtine, and many more (what is handled at large in the third part) q *Change ſhall be a kinde of reſurrection:* and in the propoſition, *The dead* are not taken ſtrictly; but largely, for any ſuch as have changed their firſt life. But take we *the dead* properly and natively, for ſuch onely as indeed have died; the propoſition is falſe, and muſt be denied; ſince we ſhall not all die, but ſome ſhall be changed; and yet both the one and the other ſort ſhall be raiſed.

Salmeron again, on 1. Cor. 15. thus objecteth; r *While the bridegroom tarried, they all ſlumbred and ſlept,* Matth. 25. 5. Did not Salmeron ſleep, ſlumber, and dream, when he produceth theſe words to prove that all ſhall die? when the words have apparent reference to the ſupine ſecuritie of their mindes; and perhaps, if you will, to their bodily ſluggiſhneſſe, drowſineſſe, and ſleep, if there were any realitie in the parable. Death was never meant in theſe words: for Chriſt doth not *there*, that is, *at the reſurrection*, tarrie; but *he that ſhall come will come, and will not tarrie*, Heb. 10. 37. He continueth objecting thus; s THOU FOOL, THAT WHICH THOU SOWEST IS NOT QUICKENED EXCEPT IT DIE, 1. Cor. 15. 36. *Therefore All ſhall die, becauſe All ſhall be quickened.* I anſwer, The Apoſtles drift in that place is, not to ſhew whether any ſhall remain alive, or all die: but he onely proveth by naturall reaſon, that reſurrection may grow out of putrefaction. Secondly, even they themſelves who ſay *All muſt die*, cannot take the words exactly as they ſound. For then as the ſeed hath time to rot, and rotteth ere it quicken, ſo the bodies of men ſhould ſuf-

fer

n *Si Chriſto & matri Chriſti mors non pepercit, cui parcet?*

o *Qui cum Chriſto mortui non ſunt, non reſurgent, nec erunt membra ejus.*

p *Reſurrectio eſt ſolummodo mortuorum: At omnes reſurgent: Ergò omnes morientur.*

q *Immutatio erit vice reſurrectionis.*

r *Tardante Sponſo, dormitaverunt omnes, & dormierunt.*

s Stulte, quod ſeminas non vivificatur niſi mortuum fuerit: *Ergò Omnes morientur, quia Omnes vivificabuntur.*

fer corruption and putrifaction, as the ſeeds do; which they dare not ſay. Laſtly, ſeeds do not die *properly*; there is no ſeparation of a ſoul from a bodie: they die *analogally* and *improperly*: and ſo do even thoſe who ſhall not *die*, but ſhall be *changed*.

An other objection is, Geneſ. 3. 19. *Duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return.* Peter Martyr anſwereth, [t] *That is, whileſt this world laſteth, and till the day of judgement break off the courſe of nature.* But I ſay, that even ſuch as maintain that every one muſt die, will not ſay they ſhall *reverti in terram, Be incinerated and turned into duſt and earth:* for they allow a very ſhort time, till the bodies reunion.

If any will ſtill urge the generality, and preſſe the extent of the words, and force of the decree, *It is appointed unto men to die:* I anſwer with Bellarmine himſelf, [u] *The decree is performed, if all the poſterity of Adam be obnoxious to death:* Or as S. Auguſtine anſwered the Pelagians, concerning thoſe which ſhall be alive at Chriſts coming; [x] *It ſufficeth that they were appointed to die: and die they ſhould if the world had endured. By caſualty they are freed from death, nor doth the diſpenſation with ſome particular ones infringe the univerſall cauſe,* as I vouched in the ſecond book. And (as S. Auguſtine goeth on) *when they have lived a life full of miſerie, and calamitie, who can ſay, they have not taſted death? eſpecially, ſince thirſt, hunger, cold, heat, infirmities, croſſes, ſickneſſes, are nothing elſe but a daily dying.* In which regard the wiſe woman of Tekoa, in her ſubtile oration ſaith not, *We ſhall all, and every one die*, but 2. Sam. 14. 14. *We die* (MORIENDO MORIMUR; ſo runneth the Hebrew) *and are as water ſpilt on the ground*: when immediately, both before and after, ſhe had ſpoken of outward croſſes. [y] *Even whileſt we are growing, our life decreaſeth*, ſaith Seneca: Which S. Auguſtine, *in libro Soliloq. cap.* 2. thus enlargeth, [z] *My life in going forward, groweth backward: and by how much it advanceth forward, by ſo much it maketh a nearer approach to death.* As the fire it ſelf conſumes its fuell, and is nouriſhed by the conſumption of it: ſo mans age is fed and nouriſhed by the conſumption of his life, and of the age he liveth in. Man at the ſame time begins to *live*, and *die:* for LIFE is but the way tending to DEATH: [a] *In our birth we die, yea long before it.* From the inſtant of the ſouls infuſion, we begin to die. Laſtly, I ſay, in that Chriſt died for all, Although ſome be extraordinarily diſpenſed withall, yet one may be ſaid to die, *Chriſt by the grace of God taſted death for every man.* Heb. 2. 9. Thus much ſhall ſerve for the firſt part of the anſwer.

t *Id eſt, Quamdiu orbis durare pergat, & niſi dies judicii curſum naturæ intercipiat.*

u *Decreto ſatisfieri videtur, ſi omnes Adæ poſteri, mortis obnoxii ſunt.* Tom. 3. de amiſſione grat. & ſtat. pec. 4. 15.

x *Satis eſt, illos fuiſſe morti deſtinatos; quæ ſubſecuta eſſet, ſi ſeculum proceſſiſſet. Quòd eximantur à morte; erit caſus; neque privilegium paucorum univerſali cauſæ derogat.*

y *Etiam dum creſcimus vita decreſcit.*

z *Vita mea, quantò magis creſcit, tantò magis decreſcit; quantò magis procedit, tantò magis ad mortem accedit.*

a *Naſcendo morimur, imò longè ante nativitatem morimur.*

O Blessed Saviour, who art life in thy self, and the fountain of life unto others, Grant, I humbly beseech thee, that when I shall passe from this present world, from this dying life, or living death, I may evermore live by Thee, in Thee, and with Thee. Amen. Amen.

CHAP. II.

1. *The third question resumed*, Whether every one must die? *The second part of the answer unto it*, That some have been excepted, as Enoch and Elias. *The controversie hath been exquisitely handled by King James, and Bishop Andrews.*

2. *Bellarmines third demonstration, that Antichrist is not yet come, propounded. The place of Malachi 4. 5. expounded by Bishop Andrews: and enlarged by my additions. The Papists objection answered.*

3. *The place of Ecclesiasticus 48. 10. concerning Elias, examined.*

4. *Another place of Ecclesiasticus, 44. 16. concerning Enoch, handled at large against Bellarmine. Enoch was never any notorious sinner, in some mens opinion: Others, otherwise. Their arguments for both opinions are onely probable, and answered. My opinion: and it confirmed. Some think Enoch died. Strange and various opinions concerning S. John the Evangelist, his living, death, and miraculous grave. More miracles, or else mistakings, in the Temples of Christs Sepulchre, and of his Assumption, about Jerusalem. S. John did die. Enoch did not die, but is living. Mine own opinion of the place Genes. 5. 24. Et non ipse: and it confirmed. A comparison between Enochs, Elijahs, and Christs ascension. The posture and circumstances of Christs ascending.*

5. *Bellarmine and others say, Paradise is now extant in the earth, or in the aire, saith Lapide the Jesuit. The old translation censured. The heaven, into which Enoch and Elias were carried, was not Aërium, nor Cœleste, but Supercœleste. The earthly Paradise is not extant, as it was. Salianus with others say truly, The materiall remaineth, not the*

the formal; Supereſt quoad Eſſentiam, non quoad Ornatum: *The* Place *is not removed, but the* Pleaſure, *and* Amenitie. *Saliānus his groſſe errour, That Enoch and Elias are kept by Angels, within the bounds of old Paradiſe on earth.*

6. *Enoch ſhall never die, as is proved from Hebr.* 11. 5. *Three evaſions in anſwer to that place, confuted. Melchizedech, and ſtrange things of him. The Eaſt-Indian language hath great affinitie with the Hebrew. An errour of moment in Guilielmus Poſtellus Barentonius. Elias was not burnt by that fire which rapted him.* Soul and bodie concur to make a man, *ſaith Auguſtine from the great Marcus Varro. Vives taxed. Moſes at the tranſfiguration, appeared in his own bodie. An idle conceit of Bellarmine, concerning Moſes his face, and good obſervations of Origen upon that point. It is probable, that Elias was changed at his rapture, and had then a glorified bodie. An humane ſoul may poſſibly be in a mortall bodie in the third heaven. Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, are in their bodies in hell, properly ſo called, and alive in the hell of the damned. Ribera and Vitgas confuted. Our Doctour Raynolds was not in the right in this matter. Some kinde of proofs, That Enoch and Elias are in glorified bodies in heaven. The place of Revel.* 11. 7. *concerning the two Witneſſes, winnowed by Biſhop Andrews. Enoch and Elias are not thoſe two witneſſes.*

THe main third queſtion being, *Whether all men, and every one muſt of neceſſitie die?* the firſt part of the anſwer was, *That there was no abſolute neceſſitie, but there might be an exception.* The ſecond part of the anſwer touched at, was this; *That ſome have been excepted, who never did die, nor ſhall die.* If I be further demanded, *Who they be?* I will onely inſiſt in *Enoch and Elias.* The controverſie concerning which two men, is ſo exquiſitely handled by the moſt learned Monarch, our late Soveraigne King James, in his monitory Preface, and by his Second, the reverend Biſhop Andrews, in his anſwer to Bellarmine his Apologie, *cap.* 11. that the moſt ſcrupulous inquiſitour may be ſatisfied.

After I have ſelected ſome matters of moment from that unanſwerable Prelate, I will take leave to glean after the gathering

thering of their full ſheaves, and to diſcover a few cluſters, after their plentifull vintage; and to bring to your taſte ſome remarkable paſſages concerning Enoch and Elias, which (perhaps) they thought fit to omit, as affecting brevitie, or tying themſelves moſt ſtrictly to the queſtion, whileſt the nature of my Miſcellanies give me licence to travel farre and neare.

2. Bellarmine, *Tom. 1 de Romano Pontifice* 3. 6. makes it his third *Demonſtration* (as he calleth it) that Antichriſt is not yet come, Becauſe Enoch and Elias are not come; who yet do live, and muſt oppoſe Antichriſt. Bellarmines firſt place, is from Malach. 4. 5, and ſixth verſes; *Behold, I will ſend you Elijah the Prophet, &c.* The Biſhop, pag. 255. from Chryſoſtom well obſerveth, that moſt Greek and Latine copies miſreade it thus, *Ecce, mitto ad vos Eliàm Theſbitem: Behold, I ſend unto you Elias the Tiſhbite:* and ſo, becauſe the Baptiſt was not Elias the Tiſhbite, we might expect the Tiſhbite after John. Indeed the Septuagint, turned by Hierom, and in Theodoret on Malachi 4. 5. have it, *Eliam Theſbitem*, And *Codex Vaticanus ſo hath it*, (ſaith Chriſtopher Caſtrus on the place) *and all the Greek Fathers, and Tertullian, and Auguſtine de civit.* 20. 29. But in the Hebrew it is not Elias *the Tiſhbite*; but Elias *the Prophet*: and ſo it is in the fair great Bibles of our Adverſaries, of Vatablus, and others. Ribera the Jeſuit is bold (as other Jeſuits were before) to finde fault with the Bibles of Arias Montanus: [a] *In the King of Spains Bibles it is viciouſly and erroneouſly written, in the tranſlation of the Septuagint,* BEHOLD, I WILL SEND UNTO YOU ELIAS THE PROPHET: as if there had not been diverſitie of copies: and as if thoſe copies which are moſt agreeable to the Originall, were not to be preferred, or were ill and erroneous: as if we were to bring and bend the Originall to the Septuagint, as Carafa profeſſeth to reduce the 70 to the Vulgar.

[a] *Malè atque vitiosè in Bibliis Regiis ſcriptum eſt, in Tranſlatione 70, Ecce, ego mittam vobis Eliam Prophetam.*

There is an errour alſo, ſaith Biſhop Andrews, [b] *When the Grecians in both places reade, that Elias aſcended* AS INTO HEAVEN; *not* INTO HEAVEN, (*which is expreſſely in the Hebrew*) *but*, AS IT WERE INTO HEAVEN. I doubt not but the Biſhop had good ground to write ſo. But the Septuagint of Vatablus on 2. King. 2. 11. hath it, Ἕως εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, *Even into heaven*: ſo alſo it is read by him, on 1. Maccab. 2. 58. with whom agreeth the 70, of Montanus, on the Maccab. ſo alſo Druſius both reades it, and expounds it, ASSUMPTUS EST IN CŒLUM USQUE, *He was taken up even into heaven*: confirming it alſo in his notes on the place. So theſe reade it, not ὡς but ἕως, not *Quaſi* but *Uſque*: which reading affordeth no patrocinie to them, but helpeth our ſides.

[b] *Cùm Græci utrobique legant, aſcendiſſe Eliam, Ὡς εἰς οὐρανὸν non* In cœlum, (*quod expreſſè tamen habetur in Hebræo*) *ſed*, Quaſi in cœlum.

Biſhop Andrews further proceedeth to this effect, That concerning

concerning the words of Malachi, Christ, both of his own accord (Matth. 11.10. —) and being questioned (Matt. 17.10. — and Mark 9.11. —) affirmed, That that propheſie was compleat; That John did do what Malachi ſaid Elias was to do. And becauſe John came in the vertue and power of Elias; Chriſt expounding Malachi, ſaith, *Elias is come*, Mark 9. 13. Brugenſis a Papiſt, on Malachi 4, ſaith, *What is ſpoken of Elijah by the Prophet, ſeems properly to be expounded of John the Baptiſt.* And Vatablus, *ibid.* ſaith, *The place is to be expounded of Chriſts firſt coming.* So Arias ſaith, from the wiſe interpretation of the ancient Scribes, That *The terrible day* hath not reference to the laſt day of judgement, but to the coming of the Meſſias; Chriſt both approving, and proving it. The ſame Arias interprets *The ſmiting of the earth with a curſe* (Mal. 4.6.) by laying it waſte and deſolate, as Judea hath been from the time of Titus.

The reverend Biſhop thus recollecteth; Elias was to be ſent before the coming of Chriſt, Malachi 4.5. Before the firſt coming none was ſent in the ſpirit of Elias, but John: The firſt coming is to be underſtood, and not the ſecond, by the confeſſion of our learned adverſaries. Elias was called *the meſſenger* or *Angel*, Malac. 3.1. ſo is John called, Matth. 11.10, Mark 1.2, Luke 7.27. *Elias was to come*, Matth. 17.11, but, *This is Elias which was for to come*, Matth. 11.14; and, *Elias is now come*, Matth. 17.12. *Elias ſhall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children*, Mal. 4.6. *John the Baptiſt ſhall go before him, in the ſpirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children*, Luk. 1.17. Let me adde theſe things, That Elias is called *the Prophet*, Mal. 4.5. and, *He ſhall prepare the way before the Lord*, Mal. 3.1. So John the Baptiſt, parallell-wiſe, Luk. 1.76. is called *the Prophet — which ſhall go before the face of the Lord, to prepare his wayes*: Yea, *More then a Prophet*, Matth. 11.9. S. Hierom, on Matth. 11. draweth out the parallels to more length: *John came in the vertue and power of Elias;* [c] *Elias and John had both the ſame grace and meaſure of the holy Ghoſt, and were equall in auſteritie of life, and vigour of minde: Each lived in the wilderneſſe: each was girded with a leathern girdle. Elias was forced to flee, becauſe he reproved Ahab, and Jezabel: John was beheaded for finding faults with Herod and Herodias.* And yet, to ſpeak truth, the ſame S. Hierom is not conſtant to himſelf; but croſſing what he ſaid on Malachi, and otherwhere, he, on Matth. 17.11. thus expounds theſe words, [d] ELIAS INDEED IS TO COME: *He who is bodily to come in the ſecond coming of our Saviour, is now come by John Baptiſt in Power and in Spirit.* Which I much wonder that the two great ſcholars of the world, either did not ſee, or would not ingeniouſly confeſſe; but towing at the rope of

[c] Et eandem Spiritus ſancti, vel gratiam habuit, vel menſuram: ſed & vitæ auſteritas, vigórque mentis, Heliæ, & Joannis, pares ſunt; &c.

[d] Elias quidem venturus eſt: Ipſe qui venturus eſt in ſecundo Salvatoris adventu; juxta corporis fidem, qui nunc per Joannem venit in virtute & Spiritu.

of contention, each of them would have S. Hieron to be wholly on his ſide, when in this point he is on both ſides.

Again, the firſt coming of Chriſt is neceſſarily to be underſtood by Malachi. For *the meſſenger*, and *the covenant whom ye delight in*, are coupled together, Mal. 3. 1. but no covenant, that we delight in, cometh at the ſecond coming of Chriſt, but did come at the firſt approach of the Meſſias, even the covenant of peace. Moreover, what *offerings of Judah and Jeruſalem ſhall be pleaſant to the Lord, as in the dayes of old, and as in former yeares*, Malach. 3. 4? ſhall ſuch offerings be after Chriſts ſecond coming? And, if ſuch were; yet after all this, he ſaith, Mal. 3. 5. *Chriſt will come neare to you to judgement*; Shall we have an other judgement after the ſecond, which the Spirit of God calleth the *Eternall judgement*, Heb. 6. 2. and is the laſt judgement, by an univerſall agreement? Beſides, as the laſt day may be called, and truely is, *a terrible day*; yet the righteous are then to *hold up their heads*, Luk. 21. 28. and it ſhall be a day of *joy* and *rejoycing* to them; though it be *diſmall* to the wicked: So the day of Chriſts firſt coming, though it was accompanied with *good tidings of great joy, which ſhall be to all people*, Luke 2. 10. yet was it alſo a *dreadfull day* to the wicked and diſobedient men; worſe, then if he had never come: and it was dolefull alſo to the evil ſpirits, whom he then vanquiſhed, caſt out, and *tormented before their time*, Matth. 8. 29. triumphing over them in his own perſon, and trampling them down, and breaking them in pieces with his rod of iron, in their own kingdome: and therefore may juſtly be called, in reſpect of them, *a terrible day*. The Prophets teſtimonie reacheth home, for confirmation hereof, Iſa. 61. 2. *He hath ſent me to preach the acceptable yeare of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all that mourn.* Which Propheſie Chriſt himſelf (Luke 4. 18, &c.) applieth to his firſt coming, and addeth remarkably (verſ. 21) *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your eares.* The day of vengeance (you ſee) is threatned in Chriſts firſt coming: And is not the day of vengeance unto ſuch, to whom vengeance paſſively belongeth, a *terrible day*? Which truth is alſo confirmed by that admirable ſimilitude fore-propheſied in the law of Moſes, and applied to Chriſt in the law of Grace; concerning Chriſts being, not onely a *chief corner-ſtone*, 1. Pet. 2. 6. and *the head of the corner*, Pſal. 118. 22. *Elect and precious*, ſaith S. Peter: *a tried ſtone, a ſure foundation*, Iſa. 28. 16. and *for a ſanctuarie*, Iſa. 8. 14. *and whoſoever beleeveth on him, ſhall not be aſhamed*, Rom. 9. 33: But alſo, Chriſt is compared to *a ſtumbling ſtone*, and *a rock to make men fall*, Rom. 9. 32, 33: or, as Iſaiah hath it, *a ſtumbling ſtone, and as a rock to fall upon: — and as a ſnare, and as a net: — And*

many

many shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, and snared, and taken, Isa. 8. 14. &c. *Whosoever shall fall on this stone, shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it shall grinde him to powder,* Matth. 21. 44. And is not such a stone *terrible* to such as fall on it? or on whom it falleth: and is not that time *terrible*, when it falleth? This is prophesied of Christs first coming; and so his first coming is truely said to be a *terrible day* unto some.

Lastly, it is insinuated, that Christ, when he cometh, may *smite the earth with a curse*: which must be understood of his first coming: for after his second coming, after the day of judgement, the earth is not to be cursed, but rather blessed: For there shall be *a new heaven, and a new earth; -no sorrow, nor crying, nor pain,* Revel. 21. 1, 4. Upon which reasons, and others, I have wondred that the divine Drusius should be so caught with the Jewish fable, as to doubt whether Elias be come, or no. Drusius, in his castigations or notes on Ecclesiasticus 48. 11. thus, [a] *To this day many think and beleeve that this prophesie of Malachi was onely by the Baptist in part fulfilled: and they hold that Eliah shall personally and bodily appeare, toward the second coming of our Lord, before the last judgement. Whether these things be true or false, I determine not. This onely I will say, The Jews do as yet, and to this houre look for Eliah to come with their Messiah: and of him they have this saying, WHEN ELIAH COMETH, HE SHALL TEACH US ALL THINGS.* I reply; What part, what syllable in Malachi concerning Elias, was not fulfilled by John the Baptist? If many do now beleeve otherwise, they are such as are Jews, who neither beleeve the words of our Saviour, who said Elias was come; and therefore think Elias shall come, because they think their Messias is not come at all: or at least they do Judaize in this point, whosoever they be that expect the personall coming of the Tishbite.

Christopher Castrus the Jesuit, on Malach. 4. 8. concludeth, That the true Elias shall yet come, because it was the voice of the Jews, and the expectation of the Scribes and Pharisees, who said in the same places, that Elias should come [b] *before Christs glorious appearing, as S. Hierom writeth on Matthew.* First, I answer, that the Jews did expect the coming of their Messias, to be glorious in all worldly pomp. Secondly, I call not now to minde, that the Scribes, Pharisees, or Jews, ever expected a second coming of their Messias. Thirdly, whereas our Saviour saith, Matth. 17. 11. *Elias truely shall first come, and restore all things:* though these words were spoken after John the Baptist was beheaded, yet Christ meaneth not, that Elias shall come corporally; but in answering his disciples, he propoundeth the objection of the Jews, which they before alledged more briefly, and speaketh according to their opinion: *Elias indeed shall come;* and then, in the verse following, Christ saith unto his

[a] *Hodie multorum opinio est, credentium istud Malachiæ vaticinium ex parte tantùm in Joanne completum fuisse. Hi tenent, venturum adhuc Eliam in propria persona, sub adventum Domini; quem vocant alterum, sive secundum; hoc est, ante extremum judicium: Quæ omnia, an falsa sint, non decerno. Hæc tantùm, Judæos etiamnunc, cum sino ἀπεκδύσει, expectare Eliam, de quo hîc sermo est: unde dicunt, Cùm venerit Elias, ipse docebit nos omnia.*

[b] *Ante Christum gloriosum, ut super Matthæum asserit Hieronymus.*

disciples thus in effect, by way of correction, *Whatsoever the Scribes say or affirm concerning Elias his bodily coming, is not literally to be understood; BUT I SAY UNTO YOU, THAT ELIAS IS COME ALREADY.* And what he saith to his disciples here, he saith to the people, Matth. 11. 14. *If ye will receive it, This is Elias which was for to come.* He fore-knew that some would not beleeve him; and therefore he said, *If ye will receive it, This is Elias*; This John, who then did live, this John *is Elias*; not which shall come (this is the exposition of the Jews:) but this John is that Elias which *was to come*, and now is come, and the prophesie fulfilled. *He that hath eares to heare, let him heare.*

The last words (as Hierom well observeth) do evince, that the former, to wit, *If ye will receive it, This is Elias*, are mysticall, and hard to be understood; no plain sense, or manifest sentence. Whence I inferre, that plain and easie it would have been to the Jews, if he would have said, as they did think, That Elias should come bodily; although the Baptist did resemble him in vertue and power, and was equall unto him. But here is the mysterie, That Malachi never intended, that Elias should live on earth corporally, against Christs second coming: but that the Baptist was prefigured in Elias; and whatsoever was prophesied by Malachi of Elias, was accomplished by the Baptist: and no other Elias to come, but the Baptist in vertue and power of Elias, and not according to the outward letter. Here is a mysterie, here is depth, which the [a] *Jews and Jewishly addicted hereticks* (as Hierom styleth them) will hardly beleeve.

3. Bellarmine, *de Rom. Pontif.* 3. 6. draweth the second and third part of his third demonstration from two places of Ecclesiasticus: The first is, Chap. 48. vers. 10. *Who art ordained for reproofs in their times, to pacifie the wrath of the Lords judgement before it brake forth into furie, and to turn the heart of the father unto the sonne, and to restore* (or *establish*) *the tribes of Israel.* First, I may answer, Ecclesiasticus is not held Canonicall, but Apocryphall; even by such as, for the many divine and admirable things in that book, could wish (if it were no sinne to wish) that it were truely Canonicall. And Apocryphals are not held sufficient to settle a point of controversie. Secondly, it may be also said, that Jansenius maintaineth, this place proveth not that Elias shall come personally, because Ecclesiasticus wrote according to the received opinion of those times, which, from the words of Malachi, beleeved that Elias was to come in his own proper person. Bellarmines reply upon Jansenius is shallow in this point, saying, [d] *If Jansenius saith truth, it followeth that Ecclesiasticus hath erred, and writ some false things*: as if he, who writeth the opinion of others, may not relate an errour, and

[a] *Judæi, & Judaizantes hæretici.*

[d] *Si id est, ut Jansenius dicit, sequitur Ecclesiasticum errâsse, & falsa scripsisse.*

and write falſe things; though he erre not himſelf, nor beleeveth the falſe things. S. Matthew, chap. 2. 6. wrote what the Jews ſaid concerning the place of Chriſts birth; the things were miſcited, and yet no errour or fault in S. Matthew. The Spirit of truth hath written, that *The fool hath ſaid in his heart, There is no God.* Becauſe the fool thought fooliſhly and untruly, God forbid that we ſhould turn fools alſo, and think that the holy Ghoſt did erre, becauſe he truely recordeth an untrue opinion, or an untrue thing, true onely in the relation: This have I ſaid, to defend both Janſenius and Eccleſiaſticus, againſt Bellarmine. Thirdly, I might anſwer, Onely theſe laſt words have the ſhadow of an argument, *To reſtore*, or *to eſtabliſh the tribes of Iſrael:* which becauſe John did not do, Elias muſt do hereafter. For indeed it is but a ſhadow; ſince as John the Baptiſt did *turn the heart of the father unto the ſonne*, (as was before proved) ſo he may be alſo ſaid, *to eſtabliſh*, or *reſtore the tribes of Iſrael*; not to any temporall kingdome, which cannot be proved to be intended by Eccleſiaſticus, (for in Malachi there is *altum ſilentium, not a word ſpoken* concerning this point:) but to the true ſervice of God, from which they were fallen: for he preached unto ſome of all ſorts; of the two tribes, of the ten tribes, yea of the Gentiles. *There went out unto John, Jeruſalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan*, Mat. 3. 5. and Jordan divided Galilee from Judea: yea Chriſt himſelf came from Galilee to John to be baptized, Matth. 3. 13. And he taught both Publicans and Souldiers, and Herod, and ſome of all ſorts thereabouts, Luk. 3. 13, 14. &c. and thus did he *reſtore*, or *eſtabliſh the tribes of Iſrael.* The Biſhops Bible hath the controverted words thus; *To ſet up the tribes of Iſrael:* So Coverdale. *Vt conſtitueres tribus Jacob*, ſaith Tremellius; according to the Greek, καταστῆσαι, tranſlated alſo by the Interlinearie, *ad conſtituendum*: or as Vatablus, *ad conſtituendas tribus Jacob, to eſtabliſh the tribes of Iſrael.* Many are the ſignifications of the word καθιστημι, but no where doth it ſignifie, to reſtore unto a diſperſed people their loſt kingdome; which is the hope of the Jews, or the expoſition of the Jewiſhly affected: not is the word καθιστημι ſo expounded otherwhere, either in the Septuagint, or in the New Teſtament, or in any claſſicall Authour. It is rendred uſually, by *conſtituere*; *Reſtituere*, is a black ſwan.

But mine own opinion is, that Eccleſiaſticus propheſieth not, what ſhould be thereafter, *viz.* after the day of his writing, either concerning John, or Elias; but onely relateth what was paſt: and it is an Eulogie, and laudatorie of Elias his worth; as appeareth by the antecedent, and conſequent narratives; where all runnes in terms deſigning out times paſſed and gone, none touching at the preſent tenſe or time, much leſſe at the future: and ſo it can be no propheſie concerning Elias perſonally to come

hereafter, especially since there is never a passage in Ecclesiasticus concerning Elias, which Elias did not accomplish before his assumption: and more particularly, he reconciled God to his children the Israelites, and turned their hearts to him. Thus did he *restore*, or *establish the tribes of Israel*, in his time: for, 1. King. 18.21. *Elias said unto all the people* (that were gathered out of Israel) *How long will ye halt between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him*: And then by miracle under God, he established them, or restored the tribes to the right religion, from which they were fallen by idolatrie, the fall of all falls fowlest. Even Bellarmine himself expounds *Restituerunt, they restored*, by *Converterunt, they converted*, in this very chapter: thus farre truely proving, that Zuinglius and Luther were not the Enoch and Elias prophesied of, because Elias was to convert the Jews, and indeed converted many, (as I proved before) which neither Luther nor Zuinglius did, for ought that I have read.

4. The second place insisted upon by Bellarmine, is Ecclesiasticus 44.16. *Enoch was translated, being an example of repentance to all generations.* The Septuagint have it thus, Μετετέθη, ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας τοῖς γενεαῖς, *Translatus est, exemplum pœnitentiæ generationibus, He was translated, being an example of repentance to following generations*, saith the Interlinearie: *Nationibus, to the nations*, saith Varablus: *Ut det Gentibus sapientiam, that he may give wisdome to the Gentiles*, saith the Vulgat edition, printed by Petrus Santandreanus, 1614, and it hath in the margin *Pœnitentiam, repentance*. But to leave that varietie: the Vulgat is not properly translated, for it is not, Ἔθνεσι, *Gentibus, to the Gentiles*, as opposed to the Jews; but γενεαῖς, *Posteris*, or *Generationibus, to future posteritie*. And if it were *Gentibus*, as Bellarmine readeth it, yet it maketh the more against him, who would have Enoch, and especially Elias, do greater things for the Jews, then for the Gentiles.

Lastly, it is not so much as intended by any word of Ecclesiasticus, that Enoch shall hereafter appeare in the flesh personally, and then die; and be an example of repentance to the Nations: for after he had so long pleased God and walked with God in this world, and after he was taken by God from amongst men (and no doubt, much more, then pleased God, and walked with God) if he should come again into this world, here to live; should he sinne again, that he might be an example of repentance? The conceit is vast, harsh, and improbable, if the supposall should have a certain accomplishment: but that this, and all other controverted points of moment, concerning Enoch, or Elias, may be the better cleared, let us examine these questions.

1. Whe-

1. Whether Enoch in his life-time, was ever any great ſinner?
2. Whether Enoch did ever die?
3. Whether Enoch and Elias now live in and with their bodies, in Paradiſe?
4. Whether ever they ſhall die; or do live with glorified bodies in the higheſt heavens?

Concerning the firſt, *Whether Enoch in his life-time was ever any grievous ſinner?* Firſt, I anſwer and ſay, I ſpeak not of the firſt Enoch, the ſonne of Cain, the grand-childe of Adam and Eve, in honour and memoriall of whom, *Cain built a citie, and called the name of the citie after the name of his ſonne, Enoch*, Geneſ.4.17. but of the ſecond and younger Enoch, the ſonne of Jared, Geneſ.5.18. of the poſteritie of Seth.

Secondly, I queſtion not, but that this latter, beſt Enoch, was a ſinner; and in his own eſtimate, a great ſinner: and he might have ſaid, and doubtleſſe did ſay in effect, as David did, and as Adam, and all his of-ſpring (except Chriſt) *Have mercie upon me, O God*, Pſal.51.1. and, *Create in me a clean heart, O God*, Pſal.51.10. *O Lord pardon mine iniquitie, for it is great*, Pſal.25.11. And in the ballance of God (ſetting aſide mercie) he might have been weighed, found light, and accounted for a main delinquent. But this is the *Quare*, Whether comparatively, and in reſpect of other men, even of ſuch whoſe lives ends alſo pleaſed God, he was ſo notorious a ſinner, that he alone was the fitteſt example of repentance to ſucceeding generations? My anſwer is negatively: for I am ſure, Adam, and, as I think, Noah, and Lot, and divers other holy Patriarchs, might as well, yea rather, be an example of repentance to future times, then Enoch; eſpecially, if we meaſure ſinnes by the records of Scripture: for the holy Writ hath more amply inſiſted upon their ſinnes, then upon Enochs; and no part of the Canonicall Scripture toucheth at any thing that was extraordinarily offenſive in Enoch; but magnifieth his goodneſſe, Gen.5.22. and his faith, Heb.11.5. Yet, becauſe the divine Writ might omit the offences of Enoch; and becauſe I cannot think that Eccleſiaſticus wrote without ſome ground, let us ſearch what other Authours have conceited, or written, for, or againſt Enoch.

Some think that Enoch, all the courſe of his converſation amongſt men in this world, lived unblameably, and walked with God. Some Jews held, that Enoch was an incarnate Angel; [e] *Whileſt he lived, he lived worthy of praiſe*, ſaith Druſius. Others write, that in his youth he was very wicked; but after repented, and turned heartily to God, redeeming the time. Druſius proveth, that Enoch was a good man ſtill, by theſe arguments. Joſephus, *Antiq.* 1.5. at the end ſaith, *Seth was a vertuous man, and left* [f] *iſſue like himſelf; and they were all good men: therefore Enoch was ſo.* The poſteritie of Seth, according to the beſt

[e] *Vixit, dum vixit, laudabiliter.*

[f] *Nepotes ſui ſimiles.*

interpreters, are called *Filii Dei, the ſonnes of God*, Geneſ. 5. 2. [g] *Auguſtine accounteth that they were called the ſonnes of God, who pleaſed God.* Hiſchuni alſo, an Authour cited by Druſius, ſaith, *Becauſe Enoch was juſt, the Scripture,* [h] *to diguiſe him, uſed a new phraſe concerning him, ſaying, HE WAS NOT.* And, *It is a probable reaſon, that Enoch was not any time ſo ill, as ſome imagine; becauſe he lived with Adam* 308 *yeares, and miniſtred ſo long unto him, as it is in libro* JOHASIN, ſaith Druſius.

On the other ſide, [i] *Some ſay he was light and inconſtant: ſometimes juſt, ſometimes wicked, as is recorded in the great Geneſis* (a book called in Hebrew, *BERESITH RABBA*) *made by one Ibbo:* ſo relateth Druſius in his book called Henoch, chap. 5. If Ibbo had ſaid, *Henochum fuiſſe modò improbum, modò juſtum, That Enoch was now and then wicked, now and then juſt*; I ſhould farre rather have conſented: for every juſt man, except Chriſt, was ſometime wicked. But that Enoch, after he was once juſt, turned to be extraordinarily wicked, I can never beleeve. For the Spirit would never have given him this teſtimonie, that he pleaſed God, and walked with him; if he had after returned as the dog to his vomit, or as the ſow to her wallowing in the mire. Rabbi Levi the ſonne of Gerſom thus, [k] *Enoch walked with God after he begat Methuſalem,* 300 *yeares:* whereby he intimateth that he walked, [l] *Not in the narrow paths of the Lord, but in the high wayes of the world:* and by that account he might be wicked ſixtie five yeares of his age, or thereabouts. The arguments of either ſide are but weak, and may be eaſily anſwered. Seths poſteritie might do ſome notable wicked acts; and moſt heartily repent, and be both holy, and accounted the ſonnes of God. The phraſe uſed concerning his being taken out of this world, evinceth not, that all the former paſſages of his life were juſt. Thirdly, he might live in Adams time, yet not neare him: and he might live with him, and yet not miniſter unto him: and he might miniſter unto him, and yet be wicked before he miniſtred; yea, even for a time whileſt he miniſtred unto Adam. Many godly parents have lived to ſee wicked ones of their of-ſpring: and it may be that Adam converted him not, till after ſome time that he miniſtred unto Adam, and had ſeen evident ſignes of Adams own great repentance and holineſſe.

On the other ſide, Ibbo writeth like a fabler; and his words were before rejected, as improbable. Rabbi Levi, alledging nothing but conjecture, wanteth weight for an argument.

Now, as there is nothing certain, either *pro*, or *contra*; ſo, if my opinion be asked, I ſhall manifeſt my ſelf to think, that Enoch was ſometimes a grievous ſinner; and after, a moſt contrite repentant, and a moſt holy man. My reaſon is, Becauſe I aſcribe more to the books called Apocryphall, then to any

[g] *Filii Dei ſunt, judicio Auguſtini, qui ſecundum Deum vivunt.*
[h] *Honoris cauſâ.*
[i] *Sunt qui inſimulant eum levitatis & inconſtantiæ: nam aiunt modò juſtum, modò improbum fuiſſe. Id relatum in Geneſi magno.*
[k] *Enoch ambulavit in viis Domini, poſtquam genuit Methuſalem, annos* 300.
[l] *Non in viis domini, ſed in viis ſeculi ſui.*

any humane Authour: for they alone are, and have been many hundreds of yeares, joyned with the Canonicall Scripture, and read in all Churches, except the Jewish, as ſet times, as well as the Canonicall; as no other writings of any other are. And if no part of them were divinely inſpired: yet were the men that wrote them, both holy and learned; and the Churches of God have dignified them above all other writings.

Now, though the undoubted Canon mentioneth not any evill act or acts of Enoch (as millions of millions of matters are omitted, both in the Old and New Teſtament;) yet ſome paſſages of the Apocryphals bend me to think, that Enoch was ſometimes a great ſinner: for he was an example of repentance unto poſteritie: therefore, in likelihood, his ſinne was exemplarie, and his repentance proportioned in a ſort unto it.

When Chriſt ſaid, John 13.15. *I have given you an example, that ye ſhould do as I have done to you*; the precedent actions demonſtrate, that he ſhewed great humilitie, and brotherly love, to which he exhorted them. When S. James ſaith, chap. 5.10. *Take the Prophets for an example of ſuffering affliction, and of patience*; it may be juſtly inferred, that they ſuffered great affliction, and were very patient. So when Eccleſiaſticus ſaith, Enoch was ὑπόδειγμα (which is the ſame word, that is uſed in both the former places) *an example of repentance*; the reſultance is fair; Enoch was a very great penitent; otherwiſe he was unfit to be an example unto others; ſince exemplarie men and actions have alwayes ſomewhat above ordinary in their kinde, and are ſo excellent therein, that they are ſeldome or never out-gone by any that follow them. As the picture (though *taken to life*, as they call it) cometh ſhort of the lively bodie; and artificials of naturals: ſo doth the *exemplatum*, the *duplicate*, or *counterpain*, of the *exemplar*, the *pattern*, or *originall*. We attain not to that perfection which S. Paul had, though he commanded us to follow his example: nor he to the intire perfection of Chriſt, whom S. Paul ſet before himſelf, as the example to imitate.

Let no man nicely inſiſt, that *exemplum* and *exemplar* do differ. I profeſſe, that I weigh not matters to ſcruples, or half-ſcruples; but, though I know ſome take *exemplar* for the man from whom the example was taken, yet I uſe the words promiſcuouſly: Enoch was *an example of repentance*; therefore he was ſometimes a great ſinner: ſince as there needeth no repentance where is no ſinne; ſo he is Stoically mad, who thinketh that there needeth as great repentance for ſmall ſinnes, as for great. Degrees of ſinnes ought to have proportionable degrees of repentance. The ſacrifices were more chargeable for hainous crimes, then for little offences. Indeed one may charitably think, that Enoch was no chief delinquent, but did (as

tender conſciences will) repent much, even for ſmaller ſinnes: and an inference may be thus made; If Enoch ſo much repented for a few motes, for ſinnes not unto death; how ſit is he to be an example of repentance to us, who have ſinned a thouſand times worſe, and have beams upon beams in our eyes, and repent a thouſand times leſſe? But I rather think, according to the uſe of the phraſe in other places, that his being an example of repentance, proveth, both *primarily*, that he was a chief penitent, and *ſecondarily*, that there was ſome proportion between his repentance and his ſinne. Which I rather embrace, becauſe of another place, *viz.* Wiſd.4.10. *He pleaſed God, and was beloved of him, ſo that living among ſinners, he was tranſlated:* and verſ.11. *Yea, ſpeedily was he taken away, leaſt that wickedneſſe ſhould alter his underſtanding, or deceit beguile his ſoul:* and ver.13. *He being made perfect* (conſummated or ſanctified) *in a ſhort time, fulfilled a long time.*

My firſt obſervation is this, That theſe verſes are meant of Enoch; ſince the Apoſtle ſeemeth to have alluded to the place, Heb.11.5. which I marvell that the learned Holcot and Lyra did not ſo much as once touch at; but apply the words, with violence, to the generalitie; though the narration be in the paſſed time, not in the preſent, much leſſe in the future.

With mine opinion Druſius agreeth, expounding the words of Enoch: and the margin of Vatablus, and of the old Biſhops bibles, and of Coverdales, and of our laſt Tranſlations, do deſigne, and as it were with the finger point at the ſtorie of Enoch. The ſecond point is *in confeſſo, cleare* and *evident*, That Enoch was aſſumed whileſt he was in an holy eſtate. The third, That he was ſometimes wicked; as may be intimated from theſe paſſages:

Firſt, That he lived among ſinners: which all men els did, as well as Enoch, unleſſe the place be meant of notorious ſinners: and though an Abraham may be in Ur; a Lot, in Sodom: yet even both of them in thoſe places contracted ſome corruption. They who walk in the ſunne, are ſomewhat ſunne-burnt.

Noſcitur ex ſocio, qui non cognoſcitur ex ſe:
Who by himſelf is hardly known,
Is known by his companion.

David cried, *Wo is me, that I ſojourn in Meſech, and that I dwell in the tents of Kedar*, Pſal.120.5. The Prophet juſtly complaineth, That he dweſt among *a people of polluted lips*, Iſai.6.5. If one ſcabbed ſheep infect a whole flock, an unſound flock may infect one good ſheep. Sinne is like a gangrene, a leproſie, and the plague, of a ſpreading and infectious nature. *A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*, 1.Cor.5.6. Chriſt himſelf could not do the good which he would have done, where the peoples unbelief was exceeding, Matth. 13, 58. but he went other-

where

where, Mark 6.6. There are as well popular ſinnes, as epidemicall diſeaſes; and holy ones have been tainted in both kindes.

Secondly, It is not ſaid, He went out from among the wicked, he ſeparated himſelf, or fled from their ſight or companie, which had been ſinning in ſuch dangerous places; but, *God tranſlated him*: it was Gods act, not his.

Thirdly, ſaith the Text, *He was ſpeedily taken away*: preſuppoſe, as Lot was by the Angel pulled out of Sodom by the hand, Geneſ. 19.16. or Habbakkuk by the hair of the head; or as the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, Act. 8.39.

Fourthly, This was done, *Leſt that wickedneſſe ſhould alter his underſtanding, or deceit beguile his ſoul.* [m] *The will of man hath a power to be changed, even till death*: his underſtanding unſetled, and eaſily to be deluded with apparances; the ſoules of men in this *mundo, theater of temptations*, ſtand upon the ice, conſiſt *in lubrico, & in anxipiti, in ſlipperie and doubtfull places*: they who *ſtand*, may *fall*: who have *fallen*, may *recover*. He was taken away ſpeedily, to the intent he might not ſinne: which the all-ſeeing eye needed not to have done, if he could not have loſt his ſtation: and in likelihood, would not have done, but that Enoch before that time had both turned and returned, was both bad and good; which, in the laſt place, the thirteenth verſe ſeemeth to confirm: as if his holineſſe had continued but a ſhort time; but yet was ſo intenſe, and ſo conſummate and perfect, even almoſt *ad perfectiorem gradum, to the higheſt perfection in this life*; that *in a ſhort time he fulfilled a long time.*

[n] *Enoch was juſt; but apt to return to wickedneſſe: therefore God haſtened to tranſlate him*, ſaith Rabbi Solomo. Procopius Gazæus Sophiſta in his Commentarie on the place, thus; [o] *If then at laſt Enoch pleaſed God, after he had begot Methuſalem, certainly before he begat him, as the Scripture ſaith, God did not like him, nor accept of him: Therefore it is to be aſcribed to Enochs repentance which he performed, that God made ſo much of him, and loved him.* Though Salianus ſaith of this teſtimonie, that [p] *his minde was againſt it*: yet there is no impoſſibilitie, no nor improbabilitie in it; and howſoever it be not apodeticall, yet it is not *inepta, fooliſh*, as Salianus cenſureth it. He addeth, *Perhaps Philo the Jew was of that opinion: for in his book de Abrahamo, ſpeaking of repentance, &c. he bringeth Enoch in, as an example. And it ſeemeth* (ſaith he) *that he followed Jeſus the ſonne of Sirach*, in the words cited: *viz.* Καὶ μετενόησε, δικαίοις μετανοίαις ἐν γενεαῖς, Eccleſiaſtic. 44.16. And though he ſlubbereth over the words and matter (which are to him Canonicall) and ſaith, that *The minde of the Scripture in that place is; that Enoch ſhall be an exemplarie penitent, not as David and Manaſſes, Peter or Mary Magdalene, but as John Baptiſt*: yet, I anſwer:

First,

[m] *Voluntas hominis deambulatoria eſt uſq; ad mortem, &c.*

[n] *Juſtus erat Enoch, at mente levis, ut facilè redire potuerit ad vitam improbam: ideo properabat Deus eum tollere.*

[o] *Si tum demum, poſtquam genuit Methuſalem, placuit Deo Enoch, certè antequam gigneret, ut Scriptura docet, non gratus & acceptus erat Deo. Quòd igitur amore complexus eſt eum Deus, pœnitentiæ, quam egit, imputari debet.*

[p] *Neſcio quomodo animus everſatur.*

First, no Ancient ever ſaid, John Baptiſt was an example of repentance, and did repent of any enormous ſinnes, but was alwayes holy, and moſt auſtere, preventing great ſinnes, rather then repenting; and not ſo much bemoaning his own offences, as dehorting other men, and crying out againſt their iniquities, with a charge, almoſt inforcing them to repentance: whileſt himſelf ſhewed a ſigne of his being ſanctified and illuminated, even in his mothers wombe.

Secondly, there is as much joy over a repentant, and God is as much glorified, for point of mercie, in a Marie Magdalene, or a Peter, as in a Baptiſt, or juſt man, that needeth no repentance; if not more. Procopius Gazæus, who imagined the worſt of Enochs former part of life, till he begot Methuſelah; yet ſpeaketh very good things before, of Enoch, thus; *God reſted on the ſeventh day, when he had made the world;* [q] *and now the ſame God in the ſeventh generation of the world, aſſumeth (as a ſigne of the ending of an age) I ſay, aſſumed Enoch as the firſt fruits of the reaſonable creature. He was out of Gods favour for a while, but when he pleaſed God, he was extraordinarily aſſumed.* Thus in effect Procopius, which the Jeſuit had not much cauſe to finde fault withall. Let this ſuffice for the firſt queſtion, Whether Enoch were at any time a very wicked man?

[q] *Et nunc ille idem Deus, generatione ſeptimâ, accipit (ceu ſymbolum conſummationis ſeculi) Enochum, ut primitias rationalis creaturæ, &c.*

The ſecond queſtion is, Whether Enoch did ever die?

Divers Rabbins maintain that he did die: So Rabbi Solomon on the fifth of Geneſis. Aben Ezra ſaith, *His death was ſweet, and he felt no pain:* which opinion, the Jeſuit Cornelius à Lapide aſcribeth alſo to Calvin; whether truely or falſely, I enquire not; but the matter giveth me the hint of an excurſion.

Moſes ſaid from God, Geneſ. 6.3. *Mans dayes ſhall be an hundred and twentie yeares*; and Moſes himſelf died, when he was 120 yeares old, Deut. 34.7. David ſaid, *The dayes of our yeares are threeſcore yeares and ten*, Pſal. 90.10. and he himſelf, who prayed to God to teach him to number his dayes, died the ſame yeare (being the firſt leſſer climacterical yeare, after that great one of nine times ſeven, that dangerous threeſcore and third yeare:) for, *He was thirtie yeares old when he began to reigne; and he reigned fourty yeares*, 2. Sam. 5. 4. Both theſe were moſt certain Prophets of their own deaths; and, perhaps, had more eſpeciall reference to their own times; deſigning thoſe yeares out in the more generall, which were more appropriate to their own perſons in particular. Let me adde two heathen examples, by way of imperfect parallels.

That moſt exquiſite work of nature, her glory, pride, and maſter-piece, Julius Ceſar, preferred a ſwift and ſudden death, in his choice, before any other kinde. Sueronius, in

in vita Julii Cæsaris, in fine, thus of him, [r] *When Julius Cæsar had sometime read in Xenophon, that Cyrus in his last sickneſſe ordered some things concerning his funerals; he hating ſo lingring a death, wiſhed that himſelf might have a ſudden and quick end. Again, the day before he was ſlain, as he was at ſupper with Marcus Lepidus, a queſtion ariſing, Which death was moſt commodious, and to be wiſhed for; Cæſar preferred a ſudden, unlooked for, and unthought of end.* And ſutable to his choice and deſire, in that reſpect, did a ſudden and unlooked for end befall him.

Likewiſe, that wonder of Fortune, that darling of terrene happineſſe, Auguſtus, the ſucceſſour unto the Dictatour, [s] *Almoſt as often as he had heard* (ſaith Suetonius *in Auguſto, in fine*) *that any one had died ſpeedily without long pain or great torment, he would pray that the like eaſie departure might befall himſelf, and his friends.* And, ſaith he, [t] *He died according as he always deſired, parting, as in a complement, with his moſt familiar friends, and gave up the ghoſt amidſt the kiſſes of Livia.* This ſtorie hath brought my Miſcellanie home to that point, which the Rabbin ſaid of Enoch, That he died without pain.

The New Teſtament alſo is thought to afford us ſuch an other example. [u] *It is ſaid of John the Evangeliſt, that he died without any pain*, ſaith Holcot on Wiſd. 2. 5. and by that inſtance, ſaith, concerning thoſe who roſe about Chriſts reſurrection, [x] *It followeth not, that if they died again, they had or felt any painfull death.* But becauſe of the ſtrange opinions which are held concerning S. John the Apoſtle, let me enlarge my diſcourſe a little concerning him.

Melchior Canus, *Locor. Theolog. l. 2.* ſaith, *We may hold, or deny,* [a] *without prejudice to our belief, either that he is living, or that he is dead.* The reaſon, why ſome thought S. John liveth, was, becauſe Chriſt ſaid to Peter, John 21. 22. *If I will that he tarrie till I come, what is that to thee?* Neither doth it ſatisfie them, that John himſelf ſaith, ver. 23. *Jeſus ſaid not, He ſhall not die:* for they expound that expoſition, *John ſhall not die*, namely, till that time that Chriſt doth come.

Dorotheus, ſpeaking of S. John, hath it thus; *John lived 120 yeares: which being expired, he living as yet (the Lord would ſo have it) buried himſelf.* The ſtorie is enlarged by S. Auguſtine, *Tract. 124. in Joannem*, thus, *Some report, that in certain Scriptures, though Apocryphall, it is found, that S. John, being in health, cauſed a grave to be made, and laid himſelf in it, as in a bed, and preſently died: or, as ſome think, lay down as dead, but not dead; and being thought to be dead, was buried ſleeping: and that he ſheweth his being alive,* [b] *by the ebullition of the duſt of his grave,* [c] *which duſt is believed to ariſe and to be forced from the bottome of the tombe to the top by his breath. And truly,* ſaith Auguſtine,

[r] *Quondam, cùm apud Xenophontem legiſſet; Cyrum ultimò valetudinis mandaſſe quædam de funere ſuo, aſpernatus tam lentum mortis genus, ſubitam ſibi celerémq; optavit mortem: & pridie quàm occideretur, in ſermone cœnæ, ſuper cœnam apud M. Lepidum, Quinam eſſet vitæ ſuæ commodiſſimus; repentinum, inopinatumq; prædicavit.*

[s] *Verùm quoties audiſſet cibò & nullo cruciatu defunctum quempiam, ſibi & ſuis ſuburbanis ſimilem precabatur.*

[t] *Sortitus eſt exitum ſimilem, & qualem ſuperiùs optaverat, &c.*

[u] *Et reposità in oſculis Liviæ defecit.*

[u] *De Joanne Evangeliſta dicitur, quòd dolorem in moriendo non ſenſit.*

[x] *Non ſequitur, quòd, ſi iterum moriebatur, moriebatur cum pœna, vel ſentiret etiam pœnam.*

[a] *Salvâ fide.*

[b] *Scaturigine pulveris.*

[c] *Qui pulvis creditur, ut ab imo ad ſuperficiem tumuli aſcendat, flatu quieſcentis impelli.*

guſtine, *We heard not this of light credulous men.* Whereupon he adviſeth, [c] *Let them who know the place conſider whether the earth ſpring up there, ſo as is reported. If it be ſo,* ſaith he, (if the earth or ſand bubble up like water; and, that being taken away, other ariſeth and boyleth up in the room) *it doth ſo, either to commend the precious death of that Saint; or for ſome other reaſon, which we know not.* So farre Auguſtine.

Some ſuch thing, in another caſe, is recorded by S. Hierom. Heare his own words, *Tom. 3. de locis Hebraicis,* out of the Acts of the Apoſtles, [d] *Mount Olivet is ſituated on the Eaſt of Jeruſalem, parted by the ſtream of Cedron, where the laſt footſteps which Chriſt ſet upon this earth, are imprinted in the ground, and even to this day are to be ſeen and ſhewed. And whereas the ſame earth is taken away daily by the beleeving Chriſtians, nevertheleſſe the ſame holy footſteps preſently and immediately recover their old form and faſhion.* Who alſo in the ſame place addeth another ſtrange thing; [e] *Whereas the Church, in the midſt whereof theſe footſteps are, was built of a round form with moſt exquiſite workmanſhip: yet the very top of that Church, as people report, could by no means ever be covered or vaulted over, by reaſon of our Saviours bodily aſcent into heaven: but Chriſts paſſage and way by which he mounted from earth even to heaven lieth open, and is viſible.* But our late traveller M. Sands relateth, *That the footſtep is on a firm naturall rock, and the paſſage open at the ſummitie or top of the temple of the Aſcenſion, is to receive light into that ſacred place. For that is covered as the ſepulchre (or rather, as the temple of the ſepulchre) whoſe round is covered with a CVPVLO, ſuſtained with rafters of Cedar, all of one piece, open in the midſt, like the Pantheon at Rome; whereat it receiveth the light that it hath, and that as much as ſufficeth. Juſt in the midſt, and in view of heaven, ſtandeth the glorified ſepulchre.* So farre M. George Sands. M. Fines Moriſon ſaith, *On the top of mount Olivet, the higheſt of all the mountains that compaſſe Jeruſalem, in a Chappel, they ſhew in ſtone the print of Chriſts feet, when he aſcended into heaven.*

It did a little amaze me, that theſe our two countreymen, both being learned, and both being there eye-witneſſes, do differ ſo much: the firſt mentioning a *footſtep*, in the ſingular number; the other, *feet*, in the plurall; (Anciquitie ſaith, *On the Earth*; late Writers, *On a Rocke*;) which maketh me rather bear with the good S. Hierom, who relateth from others, that the top could by no means be covered. Open, perhaps, the top was left, and open purpoſely, by ſome exquiſite workmen, whoſe skill ſome credulous ignorants could not diſcern; and they might report, that what was done, could not be done otherwiſe. But of this in either of our countreymen there is not one word. I return to the old matter.

Sixtus

[c] *Viderint, qui hunc locum ſciunt, utrùm hoc ibi faciat terra, vel petiatur, quod dicitur.*

[d] *Mons Olivèti, ad Orientem Hieroſolyma [ſitus eſt] torrente Cedron interfluente; ubi ultima veſtigia Domini humo impreſſa, hodiéque monſtrantur. Cùmq; terra eadem quotidie à credentibus hauriatur, nihilominus tamen eadem ſancta veſtigia priſtinum ſtatum continuò recipiunt.*

[e] *Cùm Eccleſia, in cujus medio ſunt [veſtigia] rotundo ſchemate, & pulcherrimo opere conderetur; ſummum tamen cacumen, ut perhibent, propter Dominici corporis meatum, nullo modo contegi, & concamerari potuit; ſed tranſitus ejus à terra ad cælum uſque patet apertum.*

Sixtus Senenſis, *Bibliotheca ſanctæ lib. 6. Annotat. 93.* ſaith, *Many moſt grave and worthy Authours have written, that S. John the Evangeliſt yet liveth.* But Chryſoſtom, *Hom. 66. in Matt.* reporteth, [f] *That he was put to a violent death:* and he bringeth in Chriſt, ſpeaking theſe words to the two ſonnes of Zebedee (of whom S. John the Evangeliſt was one, Mark 10.35.) [g] *YE SHAL DRINK OF MY CUP, & ſhall be put to a violent death, and be crowned with martyrdome, like unto me.* Euthymius alſo teſtifieth, that Chryſoſtom, in two other places, ſaith that S. John the Evangeliſt was ſlain in Aſia: which makes me wonder, that George Trapezuntius (if he be truely alledged by Sixtus Senenſis, *ibid.*) ſhould interpret Chryſoſtoms words, of the martyrdome and violent death which John (forſooth) ſhould ſuffer with Enoch and Elias, under the laſt perſecution of Antichriſt: eſpecially ſince Chryſoſtom ſo punctually deſigneth out the time paſt, and telleth what was done to John, and where.

[f] *Illum violentâ morte obtruncatum obiiſſe.*

[g] Calicem meum bibetis, (*Matth.* 20. 23.) *id eſt, Martyrii coronâ potiemini, & violentâ morte, ſicut & ego, à vita diſcedetis.*

Hippolytus, *Portuenſis Epiſcopus*, in his ſhort Tractate *de mundi conſummatione*, ſaith, *As Chriſts firſt coming had John the Baptiſt his forerunner; ſo the ſecond ſhall have Enoch, and Elias, and John the Evangeliſt.* This compariſon is very lame, and halteth: for it may be applied as well to any, as to John the Evangeliſt. Others uſe not ſo fooliſh a ſimilitude; but yet embrace a wilder opinion: for they ſay, that S. John died, and roſe from the dead, and was aſſumed into heaven. Nicephorus, 2.42. addeth, *DECEBAT, It was fit, convenient, decent and requiſite, that he, who kept Chriſts mother, and was ſo beloved of Chriſt, ſhould be ſo aſſumed, as Chriſts mother was.* O man, how proud art thou, to judge, what is convenient, or inconvenient for God to do!

Baronius, *Tom. 2. Anno Chriſti* 101. *numero marginali* 2. thus, *Sixtie eight yeares from Chriſts death, S. John died at Epheſus, as Hierom hath it de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis, in Joanne.* And Polycrates, a moſt ancient Divine, writing to Victor, then Biſhop of Rome, as Euſebius hath it, 1.25. ſaith of S. John, [h] *He died at Epheſus.* Tertullian, [i] *S. John died, of whom ſome conceived a vain hope, that he ſhould live till Chriſt came again.* Euſebius, 3.33. ſaith, *There were two Johns in Aſia: John the Apoſtle, and John the Diſciple; and both their ſepulchres were at Epheſus.* Chryſoſtom, *Homil. 26. in Epiſtolam ad Hebræos*, ſaith, *The ſepulchre of S. John is manifeſt, as of other Apoſtles:* therefore he ſpeaketh of S. John the Apoſtle: But, [k] *Sepulchres belong properly to them who are dead*, as Baronius well inferreth. So much *obiter*, concerning ſome unuſuall paſſages about S. John, occaſioned by Holcots teſtimonie of the ſtrange relation of his painleſſe death: but this I ſhall by Gods grace handle much more plentifully in my ſucceeding books, wherein againſt Car-

[h] *Epheſi obdormivit.*

[i] *Obiit Joannes, quem in adventu Domini remanſurum, fruſtra ſperat ſpes;* in lib. de Anima, cap. 50.

[k] *Non niſi mortuorum ſolent eſſe ſepulchra.*

dan, and his Indian apples, *the procurers of death without any pain*, as he ſaith; I ſhall (I ſay) under the tuition of the Almighty, prove that the ſeparation of the ſoul from the bodie is painfull: that all death is bitter, in one degree, or other.

And now I return to our Enoch; whom the Jewiſh Rabbin feigneth to have been dead without any pain; againſt whom, and all other Jewiſhly-affected, I hope to demonſtrate, that Enoch did not die, but is now living: Heb. 11. 5. Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη, τὸ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, *Enoch was tranſlated that he ſhould not ſee death: Ad non videndam mortem*, ſaith Montanus; *Nè videret mortem*, ſaith the Vulgat. The end, why he was tranſlated, was, that he might not die: and the reaſon is annexed, why he did not die; for *God tranſlated him*. Shall God intend to keep Enoch from death: and did he yet die? ſhall God be fruſtrated of his end? ſhall things come to paſſe contrary to his will? where is then his Omnipotencie? It holds firmly, *God tranſlated Enoch, that he ſhould not ſee death; therefore he died not, but liveth as yet.*

A ſecond argument (though not ſo ſharp-pointed) is this; Of the other Patriarchs it is ſaid, *They died:* ſo it is recorded of Adam, *Mortuus eſt*, Geneſ. 5. 5. of Seth, verſ. 8. of Enos, verſ. 11. of Cainan, verſ. 14. of Mehalaleel, verſ. 17. of Jared Enochs father, verſ. 20. of Methuſelah Enochs ſonne, verſ. 27. of Lamech Enochs grandchilde, verſ. 31. even of the whole holy Genealogie from Adam to Noah, of every one it is ſaid, *Mortuus eſt, He dyed:* except onely, when mention is made of Enoch, and then it is not ſaid, *He dyed*; but it is remarkably varied thus, verſ. 24, *Et non ipſe:* which our later tranſlation hath, *And he was not:* which words, you muſt not take in too ſtrict a ſenſe: for if he had died, yet had he had a being; but conſiſting of ſoul and bodie, we may truly ſay, *He was*. How then ſhall we interpret, *Et non ipſe?* I named you the Rabbin, who expounds it, *He died not with pain, as other men; but died ſweetly*. Others thus, *He was not on earth, after the ſame manner, as he was before*. This is true, and well ſtrengthened, Eccleſiaſticus 49. 14. *Upon earth was no man created like Enoch; for he was taken from the earth*; *DE TERRA SUBLIMIS ASSVMPTVS EST, He was lifted up on high from the earth*, ſaith Vatablus. This is alſo certain, that from the divers expreſſions uſed concerning Enoch, and of others, in the ſame Chapter, that were not tranſlated but died, there is more ſignified of Enoch, then of others; and in that ſpeciall unuſuall phraſe ſome ſpeciall unuſuall thing is involved concerning Enoch; But no ſpeciall unuſuall thing is ſpoken, if it be onely meant of him, as it is of others, that he died: Therefore certainly Enoch died not.

I will not recount more diverſitie of opinions; In all humbleneſſe,

bleneſſe I will preſent before you mine own conjecture. Firſt, I ſay that there is an *hiatus* in the Hebrew; and ſomewhat to be underſtood. The Spirit would leave ſome things doubtfull, and put us to the ſearch. Secondly, a ſupply muſt be made one way or other, if we will fix any ſenſe on the place. Thirdly, I would have wary, and probable ſupplements; not of imagination, and aire onely. Scaliger, *Exercitat.* 81. *Parag.* 2. ſaith thus, * *In the tables which Moſes brake, one halfe of the letter Samech was in the vtmoſt brink of the table, the other part of it was ſeen in the aire.* Or els Scaliger told an untruth; ſay I: give me fair likelihood, and not the vaſtnes of a phanſie. Fourthly, I ſay, the words, *Et non ipſe*, may commodiouſly be thus interpreted, *He was not found.* If any one ask, where I finde ground for this Commentarie; I anſwer, firſt, it is in the ſeventy, Geneſ. 5. 24. ἐν τῷ μεταθεῖναι *Non apparuit*, ſaith the Interpreter, in Vatablus; or, as himſelf commenteth, *Nuſquam comparuit*: but it is better rendred, *Non eſt inventus, He was not found.* And ſo it is rendred Hebr. 11. 5. where S. Paul hath taken the ſame words, letter for letter, from the ſeventie, (whoſe authoritie, by themſelves conſidered, I eſteem ſomewhat above the ordinary humane) and made them divine; *By faith Enoch was tranſlated, that he ſhould not ſee death; and was not found, becauſe God had tranſlated him.*

Concerning Enoch, theſe things I do further obſerve with ſome of the Fathers, with Aquin, and Cornelius à Lapide; That he was a type of Chriſt; ſo alſo was Elias: and both their raptures, or tranſlations, were figures of Chriſts aſcenſion. Again, Hebr. 11. 5. *Enoch, before his tranſlation, had this teſtimonie, that he pleaſed God.* He did not onely pleaſe God, but it was publiſhed and proclaimed, and, as it were, letters teſtimoniall from heaven, or a divine certificate was made, that he pleaſed God. And therefore I hold it very probable, that as Elijahs aſſumption was known before-hand to *the ſonnes of the Prophets, that were at Beth-el*, 2. Kings, 2. 3. and to *the ſonnes of the Prophets, that were at Jericho*, verſ. 5. as well as to Elishah himſelf, ſo was the tranſlation of Enoch alſo, known to thoſe of his time, unto whom God teſtified that Enoch pleaſed him. And it is conformable alſo to the Antitype, becauſe Chriſt before told his Diſciples concerning his departure, John 14. 28. &c. John 16. 5. &c. and verſ. 16. &c. and more punctually, concerning his aſcenſion, John 20. 17. *Touch me not, for I am not yet aſcended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and ſay unto them, I aſcend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.* Which words Chriſt ſpake, after his reſurrection from the dead, unto Mary Magdalen. Yet further, let me expreſſe my ſhewing the correſpondence between Enoch in the law of Nature, and Elias in the law of

* *In tabulis Moſis fractis, dimidiati Samech pars altera erat in extrema ora tabulæ, altera in aere videbatur.*

Moses, and our all-glorious Saviour in the law of *Grace*. Even as Elishah saw the carrying up of Elijah 2. Kings, 2. 12. yea, and fifty men of the sonnes of the Prophets beheld the same, (as it is likely 2. Kings, 2. 7, 15, and 16 verses:) so it may very well be, that God was pleased to give bodily sight, and evidence of Enoch, at his translation, to those unto whom he gave testimonie before his translation, that he pleased God. And even this fraction the substance of our Saviours ascension doth strengthen and enlighten. For, *He was seen*, not onely after his resurrection, *of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, he was seen of above 500 brethren at once*, 1. Corinth. 15. 5, &c. but in the act of his ascension, Act. 1. 9. *While they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight*: And, *they looked stedfastly toward heaven, as he went up*, verse. 10. They stood *gazing up into heaven*, and they did see him *go into heaven*, verse 11.

If any one be so curious to enquire, in what posture Christ was seen ascending; I think it is pointed at, Luk. 24. ver. 50, &c. *He lift up his hands, and blessed them: And it came to passe, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven*: [f] *Before he had finished his blessing*, saith Lucas Brugensis, on the words. The blessing which he began upon them, and with them, with words and gesture, he continued ascending; that is, with his hands lifted up, not so much upright to heaven, whither, perhaps, his heart, hands, and eyes were sent in prayer to God a little before (for prayer is a prime part of all spirituall blessing,) but with his hands lifted up over the Apostles; [g] *Not in a posture, as if he were praying to God; but as if he were dispensing his grace, and pouring out a blessing*. So [*] *Aaron lift up his hands towards the people, and blessed them*. So Simon the sonne of Onias used a most solemn form of holy service and benediction, Eccles. 50. 20. where it is said, *He lifted up his hands over the whole congregation of the children of Israel, to give the blessing of the Lord with his lips*: And his lips conveyed it by his hands towards them into their hearts, by a Ministeriall Sacerdotall exhibition. Thus [h] *Christ was taken, not as Elias flie, or as men go; but so, as if he had been carried in some mans hands, and by them lifted upward*, saith Brugensis: [i] *With an upright posture of body he visibly ascended into heaven*, saith Barradius. Another, [k] *He was transported not by any other mans help, but his own power*, saith Cajetan. [l] *Either he was lifted up by God, or else by the agilities which he hath to glorifie his humane bodies*, saith Barradius. For Aquin well observes, that as Christ is said to rise by his own power, and yet he was raised by the Father, because their powers are one: so may he be said to ascend by his own power, and yet be elevated, or assumed by the Father. [m] *He moved not (saith Cajetan) by leg-ster*

[f] *Dum benedictionem nondum absolvisset.*

[g] *Non habitu precantis Deum, sed habitu quasi impertientis & infundentis benedictionis gratiam.*

[*] Levit. 9. 22.

[h] *Sustollebatur*, vel *ferebatur, non voluntis more, aut gradientis; at ità ac si aliorum manibus gestatus, & paulatim sursum portatus fuisset*

[i] *Corporis statu recto, paulatim in cælos tendens.*

[k] *Ferebatur, non alieno adminiculo, sed propriâ virtute.*

[l] *Vel per potentiam divinam, vel per agilitatem, dotem humanitatis.*

[m] *Elevatus est in cælum, non scandendo gradibus, sed totus simul elevatus est.*

ſet beg, nor ſtretched to climbe; or go: but all parts alike, and he wholly together was lifted up. And, for the greater Majeſtie, a cloud received him, *deſcending even to his feet, in the form of a Throne, in which he ſat*, ſaith Abulenſis. *As the royall Chariot declareth the King; ſo* (ſaith Chryſoſtom on Acts 1.) *there was ſent to Chriſt, REGALE VEHICULUM*, which cloud was rather carried up by Chriſt, then he by it. When Aquinas ſaith, *part. 3. quæſt. 57. artic. 4.* [a] *Chriſt uſed not the cloud as men uſe a coach or chariot, to help them in their way.* I underſtand him of *MINISTERIUM NECESSARIUM*, *A neceſſary ſupport or ſtay* (for Chriſt had no need of ſuch an one:) yet it might be *MINISTERIUM SOLENNE*, *A ceremonious aid, and ſolemne free aſſiſtance*: he might aſſume it as a token of his Majeſtie: [b] *There was ſeen the ſigne or ſeal of his Divinitie*, ſaith Aquin himſelf. Nor is it againſt the glorie of Chriſts Divinitie, to make uſe of a cloud, or clouds. *He ſhall come with clouds*, Revel. 1. 7. *With the clouds of heaven*, Dan. 7. 13. *In the clouds of heaven*, Matth. 24. 30. *This ſame Jeſus which is taken up from you into heaven, ſhall ſo come, in like manner as ye have ſeen him go into heaven*, ſaith the Angel, Act. 1. 11. This one cloud might be ſo great, as many leſſer clouds when he aſcended, as all the clouds ſhall be in which he ſhall deſcend at his ſecond coming: or elſe, more clouds were about him, but one more eminent, on which he ſat, and with which he aſcended. And the extraordinarineſſe of this cloud might teſtifie his Divinitie; in which regard, to diſcriminate him from his forerunners, the Apoſtles *worſhipped him*, Luk. 24. 52. which was not, in any likelihood, performed to Enoch or Elias: for they were not carried up in a cloud or clouds. But *there appeared a chariot of fire, and horſes of fire: — and Elijah went up by a whirlwinde into heaven*, 2. King. 2. 11. To which is added the fiery nature of the whirlwinde it ſelf, Eccles. 48. 9. *He was taken up in a whirlwinde of fire.* The manner of Enochs aſſumption, I confeſſe, is uncertain. Aquila his Alphabet ſaith, [c] *God took up Enoch in a whirlwinde, as he did Elias:* So ſaith Rabbi Menachem, and the Zoar, on the fifth of Geneſ. Druſius in his *Henoch, cap.* 13. ſaith, לקח אותו אלהים, *Tulit eum Deus, God took him*, (which are the exact words of Scripture, concerning Gods taking away of Enoch, Geneſ. 5. 24. both in the fair Hebrew Bibles of Stephanus in *octavo*, and in the Interlinearie, and in Vatablus; though Druſius a little varie the middle word אותו) [d] *by a Jewiſh gambol, is all one with* ברוח סערה העלהו, *In a tempeſtuous winde did he make him to aſcend:* including an intimation, that in a whirlwinde they were both rapted. If the Scripture had uſed the very words in deſcribing the nature of Elias, I ſhould the ſooner have liked the conceit; but the Rabbinicall ſpeculations conclude not; therefore I will.

[a] *Nubes non præbuit adminiculum Chriſto, per modum vehiculi.*

[b] *Apparuit ſignum Divinitatis.*

[c] *Deus ſubduxit Enoch in turbine, ſicut Eliam.*

[d] *Sanè in Gematria valet,* 1 Cum vento tempeſtatis aſcendere fecit eum.

Lastly, it is improbable, but divers of the Disciples or Apostles who saw Christs ascending, might, and would have sought and looked for him, but that they were, in a sort, deterred by two Angels, who told them, That Christ was taken from them into heaven, Act. 1. 11. and therefore it was vain to seek him any longer on the earth. And most certain it is, that when the sonnes of the Prophets saw Elijah snatched up, and Elishah parting Jordan with Elijahs mantle, they said unto Elishah, *There be with thy servants fifty sonnes of strength, let them go, we pray thee, and seek thy master*, 2. Kings 2. 16. and accordingly, *they sent fifty men, and they sought three dayes, but found him not*, vers. 17. Semblably, we may well imagine, that some also did seek for Enoch, after he was translated; yea, it approacheth nearer to belief, then to imagination, upon this fair resultance, *He was not found*, say the Septuagint, *He was not found*, saith the Apostle: therefore he was sought after, therefore he was searched for. *TU NON INVENTA, REPERTA ES, I have found thee, whom I could not finde when I sought thee*, saith the old Poet: but it is harsh to say, *TU NON QUÆSITA, REPERTA ES, Thou art found, and wast never looked after.* Finding implieth precedent search, or going after, most ordinarily: but Not being found, necessarily implieth a former inquirie: Elias was not *found* by Ahab, therefore Ahab *sought* for him. Enoch was not *found*, therefore they made *inquirie* after him. So much be spoken in defence of my Comment upon the words, *Et non ipse*, which I have supplied from the Septuagint, and most especially from the Apostle, Καὶ οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο, *and he was not found*. And with it, is also ended and terminated the second *Quare* by me propounded, *Whether Enoch did ever die*, with its Answer, *That Enoch died not, either a sweet death, or a sowre, an easie death, or a painfull.*

5. The third Question followeth, *Whether Enoch and Elias now live, in, and with their bodies, in Paradise?*

Bellarmine is for the affirmative, That Paradise is now extant, and Enoch and Elias live in it. More particularly concerning Elias, Rabbi David, in his Comment. on 2. Kings 2. reports it, as the common opinion of the Jews, That Elias went with his bodie into Paradise, and there liveth in the same estate that our Parents did before the fall. Others have taken upon them to describe and circumscribe exactly the place of Paradise, in an Island now called Eden, not farre from Babylon, as certain Nestorians of the Greek Church have fabled: I say, *fabled*, because millions of learned men, both Heathen, Jews, and Christians, have seen Babylon, and lived in it, and round about it, who never had such a thought, or belief, or tradition, so farre as may be gathered by any ancient extant records. Of which Paradise whosoever desireth to see more

at large, let him have recourse to my learned friend Mr. John Selkeld, in his Treatise of Paradise. I will onely adde somewhat, which he omitteth.

Salianus (the great Annalist, from the creation of the first Adam, to the death of the second Adam, or rather to his resurrection and ascension, *ad annum mundi* 9879 saith, *Cyprian, Ambrose, Hierom, Tertullian, Gregorie, Epiphanius, Hippolytus, acknowledging the translation of Enoch and Elias, are silent concerning the place of their being. Augustine* saw it *doubtfully and disputable. Chrysostom and Theodoret like over the enquiry. Rupert* saith, *The Scripture is silent, neither are he made of Paradise, or Eden, in the place of Ecclesiasticus* 44. 16. *in the Greek text, but only in the Vulgar.* So farre Salianus.

But indeed, first me thinks, that the old Translator should have been constant to himself, and adding somewhat to the words of Ecclesiasticus 44. 16. should not have added *In Paradisum*, as he doth, without any shadow of ground from any other place but, *in cælum*, because it is so written, 1. Macc. 2. 58. *Elias was taken up into heaven*, [illegible] *In cælum receptus est*: so the Vulgar it self hath it. Secondly, the Jesuit Salianus is somewhat too favourable in that point, for S. Ambrose, *in lib. de Paradiso*, cap. 13. saith expressly, *Enoch was brought up into heaven*: and S. Hierom on Amos 9. saith, *Enoch and Elias were carried into heaven*. [r] Bellarmine, and other Papists, distinguishing *COELUM* into *AERIUM, COELESTE, ET SUPERCOELESTE*, *Aeriall, heavenly, and supercelestiall*, say, *Enoch was carried into the aeriall heaven*. I must confesse, that the region of the aire, that *Expansum*, the aëriall orb, is sometimes called Heaven: *The Lord thundred from heaven*, 2. Sam. 22. 14. *God gave us rain from heaven*, Act. 14. 17. and birds are called *the fowls of the heaven*, Psal. 104. 12. *The Lord cast down great hailstones from heaven*, (Josh. 10. 11.) *and they were more which died with hailstones, then they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword*. These hailstones came from the middle region of the aire. I confesse also, that Enoch was carried up into the aëriall heaven, but with this distinction, He was taken into it, as his *way*, not as the *end of his journey*, not as his *habitation*, or *resting place*. The case of Enoch and Elias is so like, so one in this *punctum*, that you are not to marvell, if sometimes I use the name of one, sometimes of the other: what is said of one, is meant of both; [f] *Who knoweth one, is not ignorant of the other*. Chrysostom in his oration of Elias, is expresse, that he setteth not in the aire: and bringeth in Satan, as wondring at Elias his riding through and above the clouds: neither is his reason to be contemned. Elias is not there where the devil is Prince; and what should he do among lightning and thunder, hail, snow, storm

[r] *Regnus in cælum.*

[f] *Qui unum novit, utrumque novit.*

storm and tempest? This is the portion of the wicked to drink. If you flee to the miraculous omnipotent hand of God, why may not I say the like, concerning Gods extraordinary clothing him with immortalitie, and that by dispensation unusuall, in the act of translating him? God did not let him continue on the earth, or in the aire, but assuming him into the highest heaven, did glorifie his bodie. For concerning *coelum coelestre*, Bellarmine will not say that he resteth there: nor did ever any afford patrocinie to that conceit. Indeed Seneca, *De consolatione*, sheweth that the Stoicks thought, that the souls of men departed hovered about their bodies, and in the end were carried up, [a] *to the starry heaven*. And Cicero, *De somno Scipionis*, placeth that heroical soul among the starres. Besides that the conceit is heathenish, it nothing concerneth our question of mortall bodies. But if Enoch and Elias are in the orbs, and among the spheres, which is the *coelum coelestre*; they should be hurried with diurnall motion, from the East unto the West: unlesse you place them upon the Poles, to stand there immoveably: which Poles are as imaginary, as their being there. If there they be in mortall bodies; what strange influences would the heavens poure forth upon them? since, the nearer the Object is to the Agent, the more effectually the Agent worketh. If they have the same unaltered bodies, either in the aire, or in the *coelo coelesti*, what meat, what clothing have they? The naturall mortall bodie of Elias, yea of Christ himself, after fourty dayes fast, was hungry, whilest he lived on earth. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis & remissione*, l. 3. saith, *They either live without meat; or, as Adam did, by the tree of life.* But Cornelius à Lapide renounceth the latter clause; since Paradise, and the tree of life is starved and dead. S. Hierom; *ad Pammachium*, and Epiphanius, *Haresi.* 64. say, *They live without meat.* The fore-named Jesuit fleeth to a miracle; and that is alwayes an help at a dead lift: but he dealeth most injuriously with Epiphanius, cutting him of by the skirts, and mangling his opinion. The words of Epiphanius are these, [b] *They live, since their translation, spiritually, and not as they were wont to do on earth: their bodies and flesh are spirituall, having no need to be fed by ravens; but are nourished by other spirituall food.* If the Jesuit will grant they have spirituall bodies, he will let fall his position, and the position of his fellows, That Enoch and Elias shall die.

I reassume the interrupted point, concerning Paradise; *Which*, Cornelius saith, *was taken away by the flood*; and, *The place continueth not*, saith Pererius; directly contradicting Bellarmine: and with Pererius stand Salmeron, Sa, Del Rio, and many other. I will help them to this argument: If Paradise did, and doth continue on earth, as it was then, Noah, and his familie, and

[a] *Ad ipsos orbes astris ornatos.*

[b] *Vivunt spiritualiter, & non animaliter propter translationem; tintque in corpore seu carne spirituali, & non opus habente, ut per corvos nutriantur; sed nutriuntur alio spirituali alimento.*

and all the beasts, might with leſſe ado, and more ſoon, have been brought into Paradiſe, and there have lived; eſpecially, there being no great diſtance between the place where Paradiſe was, and the abode of Noah when he builded the Ark, if Divines aim right. If Paradiſe had been on earth in Chriſts time, would not Chriſt once have gone into it? Or would the Angels, or could they have kept Chriſt out? Much, very much more might be ſaid, but Salianus hath ſaved me all that labour, who, pag. 66. of the firſt tome of his Eccleſiaſticall Annals, writeth thus, *It is a folly to think that Paradiſe is in the higheſt part of the aerial orb, or to place it by the moon. The rivers mentioned to be in Paradiſe, are on earth: how ſhall we convey, or tranſchange them to thoſe places?* And it is eaſier to ſay, then to prove, that the Angels kept Paradiſe from being overthrown with waters.

Thus doth he reconcile thoſe, which ſaid, Paradiſe is extant, and thoſe, who deny it, with a true and good diſtinction, as I conceive it, in this manner: *Let us ſay that the region and ſeat, the MATERIALL PARADISE, the place of Paradiſe, is yet extant; for ONE GENERATION PASSETH AWAY, AND ANOTHER GENERATION COMETH, BUT THE EARTH ABIDETH FOR EVER, Eccleſiaſtes 1. 4. FOR HE LAID THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE EARTH, THAT IT SHOULD NOT BE REMOVED FOR EVER, Pſal. 104. 5. Again, Pſal. 119. verſ. 90. THOU HAST ESTABLISHED THE EARTH, AND IT ABIDETH.* And ſaith he, *The place is not farre diſtant from Euphrates and Tigris. But the delicacies, trees, elegancie, delight, order and diſtribution, ordained for innocencie, are decayed; that it is not to be wondred at, if we cannot finde ſo much as the footſteps of them.* So he. *Perhaps*, ſaith Eugubinus, *as Jeruſalem, and Sion the mountain of God, and the Ark of God, ſo Eden alſo is grown writhled and wrinkled with age.* He doth well to add, *Perhaps*, for indeed, it is more likely, that it was not *paulatim*, but ſuddenly, and wholly defaced, when the Angels left the cuſtodie of it, when the flood waſhed away its beauty, and bemired it, juſt like to other places. *The ſame ground and the eſſentiall place on which Paradiſe was ſeated, remaineth ſtill: the beauty, adornation, and delights is vaniſhed*, ſaith Del Rio. *And the beddes of the rivers are chaunged, and the ſpringes break forth in other places*, as Gregorius de Valentia well collecteth. Thus farre, excellently, Salianus.

Now, as I have approved him for ſaying, *Let us ingenuouſly confeſſe, that that garden of God, is now no where, the extraordinary beauty and commodities are vaniſhed, though the ground thereof yet remaineth*: ſo have I juſt cauſe to laugh more at him, then he did at his fellows for their opinions, ſince he is ſo ſtrangely conjecturall, as to ſay, *we may ſay that Enoch and*

Elias

z *Ridiculum eſt exiſtimare, Paradiſum eſſe in aere ſupremo, aut in lunæ concavo, collocare, cùm ea quæ ſupra ſunt, ad terram deſcendere, transferre.*

y *Vetuſtate obſitabit.*

x *Paradiſus quoad eſſentiam, non quoad ornatum, quem olim habuit, ſupereſt.*

a *Simpliciter fatendum eſt, iſtum Paradiſum plane nullum eſſe.*

Elias are placed within the boundaries which inviron'd Paradise of old: and are kept there by the ministerie of Angels: yet so that no man can see them, as Christ now and then among the Jews made himself invisible. Against this I thus argue. First, whosoever placed Enoch or Elias in Paradise, placed them there, as in a place of extraordinary pleasure and delight. Paradise was ever, by all, taken for *locus amœnitatis*, or ἡδονῆς, *an extraordinary place of pleasure*; and accounted the garden of God till now. But *now there is no such unusuall pleasure*, saith Salianus; Therefore they are not now in Paradise.

Even Aristotle, *Ethicorum* 9. 9. could say, [b] *An happy man is not to be made an Anachoret*; or rather thus, *An Hermite cannot be an happy man.* And in the same chapter, [c] *No man would enjoy the whole world, on condition to have none in the earth with him. For man was born for civill conversation.* And, *Pol.* 1. 2. [d] *Man by nature is a sociable creature.* Whereupon he well concludeth, A blessed man is not solitary. For [e] *he hath whatsoever is naturall*, but to delight in company is naturall; therefore he must needs enjoy it. The great S. Augustine, perhaps, met with the same place; I am sure these are his words, *De Civit.* 19. 3. [f] *They say that an happy life is a sociable life; which loveth the welfare of friends as it doth its own good, and wisheth as well to others as to it self.* Ludovicus Vives, on the place, saith, *They were the Stoicks, who said so*: but I rather guesse, they were the Peripateticks; and Aristotle, their cheif Chaunter. Which blessed life the heathen meaned not of eternall blessednes after the resurrection, but of a blessed naturall life in this world, and on this earth: such an one cannot Enoch and Elias have, though they were in Paradise; because they have no more companie of their kinde. Enoch, more especially, had lesse happines, by this argument (if he be supposed to be in the earthly Paradise) because he was long by himself, ere Elias came to him; by the space, I say, of above two thousand yeares.

To the further illustration of the former point, I may truly say, If Adam and Eve had lived in Paradise by themselves alone, without any other companie, at any other time, I should not much have envied, or wished that felicitie, yea, though he had not fallen, whereby he became *Radix Apostatica*, in the phrase of Augustine. Yea, such a blessednes there is in communication of happines, that the all-blessed, onely-blessed, ever-blessed Deitie of the *Unitie* would not be without the conjoyned happines of the *Trinitie*: The *singlenes of Nature* would not be without the *pluralitie of Persons*.

Thirdly, do they see those men and women, and their actions, who now live in the bounds of old Eden, whilest themselves, in their bodies, are invisible?

Fourthly,

b Ἄνευθεν μὲν ἴσως, ἐν τῷ μονώτῃ πολὺν τὸν χρόνον.

c Οὐδεὶς δ' ἂν ἕλοιτο ἄνευ φίλου τὰ πάντ' ἔχειν ἀγαθὰ· πολιτικὸν γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ συζῆν πεφυκώς.

d Ἄνθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῷον.

e Τὸ τῷ φύσει ἀγαθὸν ἁπλῶς ἔχει, Eth. 9. 9.

f *Vitam beatam etiam socialem perhibent esse, quæ amicorum bona propter seipsa diligit sicut sua, eisque propter seipsos hoc velit quod sibi.*

Fourthly, here is a multiplying of miracles daily; that Angels ſhall keep them, yet ſo, that they cannot be ſeen. From Enochs aſſumption, which is now above 4000 yeares ſince, have Angels kept him, that he hath not been once ſeen?

Beſides, no one place of Scripture Canonicall ſaith, they are in Paradiſe: and it is ſo farre from a favour, as it is rather a durance and captivitie, if they be kept from all other parts of the world, within the bounds of old Paradiſe; ſince many places are now more delightfull then the place or places whereabouts Salianus himſelf now holdeth Paradiſe to be ſituated. Moreover, Elijah was taken up *into heaven*. Suppoſe that to gratifie Bellarmine, we grant, *Cœlum aeriam* is there meant: yet muſt he needs be taken up from the earth, and ſo not abide on earth, in the circuit of old Paradiſe, as Salianus fooliſhly conceiveth. Likewiſe Eccleſiaſticus 49. 14. *Enoch was taken from the earth*, Ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς· ſo Vatablus hath it, and rendreth it, *De terra ſublimis aſſumptus eſt, He was taken up on high from the earth:* the Vulgat hath it, *Receptus eſt à terra*: *E terra* had been more pithie. When the Apoſtle ſaith, *He was tranſlated*, Heb. 11. 5. was he left on the ſame earth, on which he was before? Or, after he was in heaven did he come again on the earth? It was an excellent and true obſervation of our learned Whitaker, That Bellarmine ſometimes confuting his fellows anſwers, confuteth farre better anſwers then himſelf bringeth. And I will be bold to ſay of Salianus, though he doth juſtly deride them, who make Paradiſe in the aire, as Cornelius à Lapide, and Bellarmine; or in the orb of the Moon, as others: Yet his crotchet is as fooliſh, as any of theirs. For, in what part of Paradiſe were they kept when the floud was? or was not all the earth overflown? The Angels then kept them in the aire; or elſe, by an other miracle, kept the water from over-flowing that place. That the Angels kept people from entring into Paradiſe, I have read: that they kept any from going out of it, and kept them in it, I have not read. [k] *None can ſee them*, ſaith Salianus: They may (ſay I) by the ſame divine power by which they are inviſible; if inviſible they be. Can they be ſeen by none? How was Elias ſeen by our Saviour, and his three Diſciples, at the Transfiguration? Or were all they within Paradiſe? or was Elias out of the bounds of the old Paradiſe, when Chriſt was transfigured on the mount? But theſe and greater inconveniences muſt theſe men run into, who will maintain againſt Scripture, that Enoch and Elias are in earthly or aeriall Paradiſe: that they may uphold an other crotchet worſe then this; namely, That Enoch and Elias ſhall hereafter die, and be ſlain by Antichriſt; and are not [l] *in the higheſt heaven*, which is the laſt queſtion.

[k] *Nemini conſpici poſſe poſſunt.*

[l] *In cœlo ſuperiori eſſe.*

6. Let

6. Let us ſpeak of them ſeverally, then joyntly. Concerning Enoch, the firſt of them who were *rapti*, it ſeemeth to me, that the Apoſtles words, Heb. 11. 5. not onely do reach home to that point, unto which before I applyed them, *viz.* That Enoch died not: but evince alſo that he ſhall never die. For it is not ſaid, *Enoch was tranſlated, that he ſhould not die for a good while*; but *he was tranſlated, that he ſhould not*, or *might not ſee death*: Therefore he cannot, he ſhall not die hereafter; ſince the holy Ghoſt hath expreſſed, and ſigned out the end of his tranſlation, *Nè videret mortem, That he ſhould not ſee death.*

Some may anſwer to that place of the Apoſtle, firſt, *that he ſpeaketh of THE DEATH OF SINNERS: as if he had meant, with the book of* * *Wiſdome, to ſay, NE MALITIA MUTARET INGENIUM EJUS, LEST HE SHOULD BE CHANGED TO THE WORSE: for ſinners are called DEAD MEN, according to that ſaying,* [1] *WICKED MEN, EVEN WHILE THEY LIVE, ARE DEAD*; So farre Druſius. To whom let me adde, that Chriſt ſaith, Luke 9. 60. *Let the dead bury their dead.* And 1. Timoth. 5. 6. *She that liveth in pleaſure, is dead whileſt ſhe liveth.* And to the Angel of the Church of Sardis, the Spirit ſaith, Revel. 3. 1. *Thou haſt a name that thou liveſt, and art dead.* In all which places wicked men are taken for *the dead*: yet in the place of the Apoſtle it cannot be ſo: for he was ſpeaking of the true lives and deaths of Gods Saints. And if the *literall ſenſe* can be admitted, we muſt not flee to the *myſterie*: but here is no inconvenience in the *letter*. Moreover the ſame God, who mercifully placed him in the ſtate of Grace, could as eaſily have kept him ſo, without inflicting death on him. Laſtly, the Apoſtle ſaid, Hebr. 11. 4. *Abel is dead*; and then deſcending to Noah and Abraham, at the 13. verſe, *Theſe all died in faith.* I hope no man will ſay, the word *died* is here taken for *ſinned*: but it is taken literally, that their ſouls were parted from their bodies: So the words, *That he ſhould not ſee death*, prove that Enochs ſoul was not parted from his bodie. Indeed he is one of them that are mentioned between Abel and Abraham; but yet ſingled out by expreſſe words, That *he was tranſlated, leſt he ſhould*, or *might ſee death*: and therefore he is exempted out of the compaſſe of that word *All*, by ſpeciall diſpenſation; and onely Abel, Noah, Abraham, are the *All* there meant.

Secondly, ſaith Druſius in his Preface, *It may be ſaid, the Apoſtle ſpake* [m] *of calamities, croſſes and ſickneſſes, which may be accounted as a death: as if he had ſaid, Leſt he might ſee death, that is, THE DISCOMMODITIES AND INCONVENIENCIES, WHICH ACCOMPANY DEATH.* For, who are continually ſick, are accounted as *dead*. Firſt, I ſay this is a forced interpretation;

* *Wiſd.* 4. 11.

[1] Improbi, dum vivunt, mortui ſunt.

[m] *De morte calamitatum, & ægritudinum; ut ſententia ſit, Nè videret mortem, hoc eſt, ea incommoda, quæ mortem comitari ſolent.*

tation; *Enoch was translated lest he should see death*, that is, *lest he should be continually sick*, and, *that he might not feel the discommodities, which accompany death.* Secondly, that opinion leadeth Enoch to death, but not the dolorous way to it: which indeed rather beggeth the question, then proveth any thing against me. Lastly, there is no circumstance inducing us to think, that the Apostle, by the word *death*, aimed at the large and extended signification of it, for *calamities*, or *sicknes*. Sure, about Enoch his time, there were no such notable calamities upon the Saints: and the generations of the world were then strong and healthfull.

Thirdly, saith Drusius in the same place, *It may be said, Enoch died not; because the Scripture, when it mentioneth his rapture, mentioneth not his death: so the Jews say, Jacob is not dead; because the Scripture useth the word of EXPIRING, not of DYING.* This is ridiculous; for, what is *expiring*, but *dying*? Genes. 49.33. *Jacob yeelded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people*: doth not either of these phrases, do not both evince that he died? Oh, but the Jews say, *Jacob non est mortuus*; I am sure, the Apostle, Hebr. 11.21. speaking of Jacob, saith, Ἀποθνήσκων, *as he was dying, he blessed his children*; or, *when he was a dying*, as it is in our last translation. It evinceth, he died within a while after. And I am sure again, that Christ, Luke 20.37. from the testimonie of Moses, proveth, that Jacob died. I am also sure, that S. Stephen saith, Act. 7.15. *Jacob went down into Egypt, and died.* Surely these crotchets of misbeleeving Jews should not have the least countenance against pregnant proofs both of the Old and New Testament.

Drusius yet inforceth this third answer, thus; *The same Apostle saith of Melchisedech, Heb. 7.3. HE WAS WITHOUT FATHER, WITHOUT MOTHER, WITHOUT DESCENT, HAVING NEITHER BEGINNING OF DAYES, NOR END OF LIFE. Wherefore? without doubt, because in Scripture there is no mention of his parents, and kindred, of his birth, or of his death.*

I answer. First, If it be said of all, whose progenitours, issues, kindreds, birth, and death, are unrevealed in Scripture, *that they were without father, mother, descent, having neither beginning of dayes nor end of life*; we should have many, very many more Melchisedechs in those respects; Demetrius the silversmith, and Alexander the coppersmith, and troups of the wicked; Daniel, Sidrach, Misach, and Abednego; Nathanael, and Joseph of Arimathea; S. Mark, and S. Luke, and divers others. For, what mention is there of their parents, their children, their genealogies, their birth-dayes, or of their death-dayes, in the sacred Writ? Therefore these words may be said of Melchisedech, without any reference at all to that reason:

and the words may not be ſaid of others, though the divine Scripture omitteth as much, as it did of Melchiſedech.

Secondly, if we grant that it is in part the reaſon, why he is ſaid to be *ἀμήτωρ, without a father, &c.* yet it may be ſaid alſo, becauſe no other record, before S. Pauls time, no ſacred or profane Authour, no tradition, no book Apocryphall, hiſtorified his parents, or iſſue (ſo farre as yet appeareth:) And becauſe S. Paul, who knew the names of Jannes and Jambres ſome ſuch way, or by revelation immediate, and by no ſuch way knew Melchiſedechs pedegree, might ſay as he did.

Thirdly, Eraſmus ſaith, *Melchiſedech came of obſcure parents, not worthy to be named.* Before him, Euſtatius Antiochenus ſaid the ſame: and perhaps it may be a reaſon why David called his Nephews, Joab and Abiſhai, *the ſonnes of Zeruiah*, 2. Samuel, 19. 22. (for Zeruiah was Davids own ſiſter, 1. Chron. 2. 16.) and omitted their father, for his unworthineſſe; yea, the Divine hiſtorie, where David is ſilent, often mentioneth Joab and Abiſhai, with the addition of their mothers name; but alwayes omitteth the fathers name. This I cannot think to be Melchiſedechs caſe: for being a King, and ſo glorious a Prieſt, both in one; it is moſt unlikely, that he had obſcure and poore parents: yet he might deſcend from curſed Cham; as well as Chriſt, from Moabitiſh Ruth, or from Rahab the harlot of Canaan.

Fourthly, the Jews ſay, *He was a baſtard.* But it is ſooner ſaid, then proved; for never baſtard attained, as called by God, to thoſe two higheſt conjoyned titles, of *King* and *Prieſt*. Many men have thought him to be Noah; and more, to be Sem, Noahs ſonne; as ſome Jews; Lyra, and Abulenſis: when indeed he can be neither. [a] *Some very fooliſhly think that Sem was Melchiſedech* (ſaith Procopius:) *But that is impoſſible: for when I ſet down his genealogie, it appeareth that he lived not to the time of Terah, or Thara*, Geneſis 11. 24. So he; who hitteth the truth, that Melchiſedech was not Sem: but is out in the genealogie; for both Noah and Sem lived in Abrahams time. See Cornelius à Lapide, on the Hebrews; and the learned Helvicus. *Noah*, ſaith Helvicus, *died the 57 yeare of Abraham; and Sem out-lived Abraham.*

That neither Noah nor Sem could be Melchiſedech, is demonſtrable from Hebr. 7. 6. Melchiſedechs deſcent, or pedegree is not counted, ſaith the Apoſtle, Hebr. 7. from Levi, or Abraham, or their Progenitours, who came from Arphaxad, the ſonne of Sem, the ſonne of Noah. Secondly, both Noah, and Sem, and their genealogie and generations, are perfectly and exactly ſet down: but Melchiſedech is without deſcent, or pedegree, or genealogie, Hebr. 7. 3. *as undeſcribed*, ſay they. Thirdly, we know, Sems father was Noah, Noahs father was Lamech;

[a] *Quidam admodum ſtultè opinantur, Sem eſſe Melchiſedechum: Verùm id impoſſibile eſt: ſuprà enim, cùm ejus genealogiam explicaremus, patuit, quòd nec Tharra tempora aſſequi potuit.*

Lamech; but Melchiſedechs father is not known. Fourthly, Noah died, Geneſ. 9. 29. and Sem lived not 603 yeares, as it is apparent, Geneſ. 11. 10, &c. Helvicus maketh his death fall on his ſix hundredth yeare; but there is no end known of Melchiſedechs dayes. Origen, in likelihood, fore-ſeeing the inconveniences accompanying the fore-recited, and commonly received opinion, inventeth a new trick, That Melchiſedech was an Angel. After him ran Didymus. But no Angel was ever a temporall earthly King: no Angel was ever a Prieſt, offering up bread and wine, and receiving tithes; or had an order of Prieſthood annexed to any of them: no Angel had ever pedigree from Abraham, or any other. But Melchiſedech, though he had none at all from Abraham or his aſcendents, none at all mentioned in any authentick records or tradition; yet had he one or other; of which hereafter.

There was one Theodotus, ſaith [o] Tertullian, *and he brought in a novel opinion, and held, That what Chriſt doth for men, Melchiſedech doth for the Angels.* But this cannot be; for the good Angels needed not any Mediatour of Redemption; no, not Chriſt himſelf; nor ever had, nor ever ſhall have. This Arch-heretick had other Melchiſedechians, who taught, that Melchiſedech was a certain vertue, or power, greater then Chriſt; becauſe Chriſt is ſaid to be a Prieſt according to his order: So Epiphanius relateth, *lib. 2. Hareſ. 55.* Yet this holdeth not for the *majoritie*, or *betternes*; but for the *prioritie*, or *typicall reſemblance*.

Some have held, that Chriſt was a Prieſt according alſo to the order of Aaron; and then, by that argument, the Aaronicall Prieſthood ſhould be better then Chriſts; which is plainly confuted in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. Chriſt accompliſhed every type of him, and according as they ſignified, did he fulfill: This doth not prove their betternes, or efficacie, greater then his: no more doth his being a Prieſt according to the order of Melchiſedech, either magnifie Melchiſedech aboye Chriſt, or any way vilifie Chriſt.

Varietie of conjectures have been manifold; I hold it probableſt, with Joſephus the Jew, with divers late Writers, with the ancient Fathers, [p] Dionyſius, [q] Epiphanius, [r] Theodoret, Procopius and others, that Melchiſedech was one of the Kings of Canaan, and came from Cham, not from Sem. And this God might ordain purpoſely, that the Gentiles might not deſpair of ſalvation: but, though Chriſt came of the ſeed of Abraham, and the Jews were Gods peculiar people; yet Chriſt himſelf was a Prieſt according to the order of Melchiſedech, who deſcended from the curſed ſeed.

That Melchiſedech was the holy Ghoſt, was a mad opinion, now forſaken of all. That he was not an Angel, nor a vertue greater then Chriſt, I proved before: but a man, a meer

[o] *De præſcriptione, cap. 53. in fine.*

[p] *Cæleſtis Hierarchia cap. 9.*
[q] *Hareſ. 51.*
[r] *In Geneſ. quæſt. 83.*

man: whoſe pedigree is not to be reckoned from Abraham, or his predeceſſours: for Abrahams predeceſſours dwelt in *Ur of the Caldees*, Geneſ. 11. 28, and 31. and, *Your fathers dwelt on the other ſide of the flood in old time*, Joſhuah 24. 2. that is, Beyond Euphrates Eaſtward, even unto the Eaſt-Indies, did Sems poſteritie reach and multiply; propagating true religion, with the hiſtories both of the Creation, and of the Deluge. In the Eaſt-Indian *Shaſter* (which is the Canon of their devotion, eſteemed by them, as the ſacred Bible is by us) there are now many fables intermixed, ſavouring more of humane invention, then of faith: yet their rationall traditions make neerer approaches to the divine truth, concerning the creation, then the more ignorant Theologie of the Romanes, till Chriſts time; and as good laws and precepts have the Eaſt-Indians, for moralitie, and government Oecomenick and Politicall, if not better, for a ſettled State. And I hold it a moſt remarkable thing, that the Eaſt-Indian language, to this day, hath farre more affinitie with the Hebrew, then any one of our Occidentall languages; yea, then all of them put together. And thoſe *Indi Aurorae*, or, as one calleth them, *Indi Diei*, have ſcarce a word, but it is found in the Caldee, Arabick, or primitive Hebrew: and by perfect knowledge in the Hebrew, one may eaſily attain to the knowledge of all other the Eaſtern tongues. Whence we may conclude the prioritie of the Hebrew tongue. See the learned William Poſtell, in his alphabet of twelve tongues, different in characters: and more ſpecially *de Indica lingua*. One great errour I cannot omit in the ſaid learned Poſtellus, in his Tractate *de lingua Samaritana*; for, from S. Hierom, *in præmio libri Regum*, and with him, he maintaineth, that it is certain that Eſdras, after the inſtauration of the temple under Zerubbabel, invented other letters, which now we uſe; and that the characters of the Samaritans and Hebrews were all one till then: and withall, himſelf found out a very probable ſpecious reaſon, why Eſdras ſhould forſake the old characters, and framed new: and yet he bringeth in the characters of Hebrew now in uſe, as delivered by God in the tables given to Moſes: whereas (if he would be conſtant to himſelf) either God gave to Moſes the Samaritan letters, and Eſdras invented new ones: or, if God gave theſe now in uſe to Moſes, the Samaritans may be thought to invent new characters, that they might differ from the Hebrews, and make their ſchiſm more irreconcileable, by the ſtrangeneſſe of miſſigured letters. Moſes was farre more ancient then Eſdras; and the Samaritans, who received no Scripture but Moſes his writings, in all likelihood uſed the letters and characters uſed by Moſes: and ſo, in concluſion it will ariſe, that the Samaritan letters and the Hebrew were all one a long time; which Poſtel-

lus

lus confesseth: and that they were exactly the same which God gave to Moses; which Postellus denieth: and after that, Esdras might invent new characters, upon the ground which Postellus framed, and the Jews (as he saith) approved: and these commonly we enjoy. I cannot omit, that you shall finde other characters of the alphabet of that language which was used beyond Euphrates, different from the Samaritan, but more from the Hebrew. And it is in the Hebrew Grammar of Abraham de Balmis, [q] *As I found* (saith he) *in a most antient book*: and he saith, *It was* [r] *the writing used beyond Euphrates*. The characters of both which, I would have described exactly, if I had been sure our Printers had the stamps; for others have not. In regard of which defect, M^r Selden, in the preface to his book called *Marmora Arundelliana*, excuseth his priming of the Samaritan, the Syriack, and Arabick words and passages used in his Commentarie, by the Hebrew letters, rather then by their own proper characters.

I am come back to Jerusalem, where Melchisedech reigned. And though he was a most holy man, and an extraordinary type of Christ; yet, I say, he came of the cursed seed. For Cham possessed all Canaan; and it was called the land of Canaan, from Canaan the sonne of Cham. And he was one of the Kings in that land: for it had many Kings, Genes. 14. Melchisedech, and Job, and many other, in the old Testament, do prove, that God was not the God of the Jews onely, but also of the Gentiles.

This place of the Apostle, Hebr. 11. 5. concerning Enoch, *Ne videret mortem*, hath occasioned much discourse; but I cannot leave Enoch yet. Indeed it is said, Genes. 5. 24. *God took him; that is, God sent for him by death*, saith Aben Ezra: and so the word לקח is taken, Ezechiel 24. 16. [s] *Behold, I take away from thee the desire of thine eyes*. Salmanticensis Judæus, *in lib. Johasin*, 58. 2. saith, [t] *Rabbi Emmi died: for death snatched him away*. And so it is in the Latine phrases, *Rapio*, and *Aufero*, what in the Hebrew is לקח.

Quis Deus, Octavi, te nobis abstulit?——
——*& te*
Raptum, & Romanam flebimus historiam.
What God, Octavius, Took the away from us?
We will bemoan the death of thee, And of our Romane historie.

So farre Drusius in the preface to his book called *Henoch*. But this is no good exposition, since God took away by death all the rest of the Patriarchs, as well as Enoch; and yet it is most singularly spoken of Enoch, *He was not found, for God took him. By death*, saith the shallow Jew: but our divine Apostle saith, *He was translated, that he might not see death*. What Christian or rationall man will doubt, but we are to incline to the Apostle?

[q] *Prout inveni in libro vetustissimo.*
[r] *Scriptura trans fluvii.*

[s] *Id est, abstulit eum Deus per mortem.*
[t] *Ecce, ego aufero à te desiderium oculorum tuorum.*
[t] *Mortuus est Rabbi Emmi, quia rapuit eum mors.*

Again, the third answer brought by Drusius (against his own opinion, as himself professeth) to prove, that *VIDERE MORTEM*, *To see death*, doth not signifie to die a naturall death, where there is a true separation of the soul from the bodie: and that, *NON VIDERE MORTEM*, *Not to see death*, on the contrary, doth not signifie To be kept alive from death, (which I, with Drusius, do say, was the true intent of the Apostle) draweth to this head, *Enoch saw not death, that is, died not; because the holy Scriptures, where they make mention of his rapture, mention not his death.* I answer, If all were true, yet it followeth not, that Enoch is dead, or shall die; which is the point questioned.

Moreover, if Enoch were dead, or to die; the wisdome of the Divine Inspirer, would never have singled out such a phrase, among so many other thousand, as should leade men to think the clean contrary. *He was translated, that he should not see death.* For there resteth the period. If it had been meant, he should die; it would have been added, *He should not see death, for a long time*; or, *He should not see death, till toward the end of the world*; or the like. But, *He was translated, that he should not see death*; Therefore he shall never see death.

Suarez, *in tertiam partem summa, quæst. 59. artic. 6. sect. 1.* saith directly, *S. Paul meaned, that Enoch should not die in that place, into which he was translated.* True; But why should he die in any other place? or indeed why should he die at all, who, above other men, was rapted purposely, *That he might not see death?* Surely, the deferring of death, for a time, is not so great a favour; The exempting one wholly from death, is a blessing above ordinary. Again, it is said of Enoch, Genes. 5. 23. *All his dayes were 365.* (where *dayes* are taken for *yeares*, as otherwhere in Scripture:) But these are not all his dayes, if either he remove from one place of the earth into an other, (which Salianus fondly imagined) or live now in a mortall corruptible bodie.

It is said of our blessed Saviour, Hebr. 5. 7. He poured out prayers *in the dayes of his flesh*; that is, whilest he lived on earth the life of nature, in an elementary, terrene, humane, passive bodie. And of some other Patriarchs, *All the dayes of* them were such, and such, Genes. 5. 17, 20, &c. that is, all the dayes while they breathed on the earth the breath of life in mortall bodies. Therefore even from the very phrase concerning Enoch, *All his dayes were 365.* we may inferre, He lived not in a mortall bodie any longer on the earth, He liveth not now any where in a mortall bodie.

Somewhat must I say also of Elias severally. Rabbi Solomon, on the 5 of Genes. saith, *When Elijah was hurried up in a fiery chariot, his bodie was burnt up of that fire:* and, *Other Jews*

agree

agree with him, saith [z] Bellarmine. For my part, I say, I will not embrace an unlikelihood, though it runne toward my opinion. I think, the cloke might have been burnt, as well as his bodie; and Elishah could not have escaped scorching, when the fire parted them. Again, the ashes might have fallen, as well as his mantle. And the Jew would account it no great favour, to be burnt alive. That fire, certainly, was rather *conservative*, then *destructive*: not *penal*, and *consuming*, as the fire from heaven drawn down by Elias, 2. Kings 1. 12. not *punitive*, and *tormenting*, as the fire of hell, *Everlasting*, Matth. 25. 41. *Unquenchable*, Mark 9. 43. but like the fierie furnace, in which the three children sang, Daniel 3. 25. or the fire in the bush, Exod. 3. 3. harmlesse, yea gracious: or the fire at the consummation of the world, which one calleth *Ignem rationalem*. The phrase then, 2. Kings 2. 11. importeth no lesse: *Elijah went up, by a whirlwinde into heaven*; Elijah, All Elijah, Whole Elijah, Soul and bodie. His soul had no need of a whirlwinde; *Elijah went up*. It is varied, 1. Maccab. 2. 58. *He was taken up into heaven*. His rapture excluded not his willingnes: his willingnes had been insufficient without his rapture: his *ascension* being grounded on *assumption*: the power being *Gods*, not *his*: or, his *passively*, and Gods *actively*.

If it be true what Bellarmine avoucheth, *That some other Jews agree with Rabbi Solomon in this, that Elijah was burnt*; Yet I am sure, [y] Sixtus Senensis citeth the opinion of other Jews, to the contrarie. For they said, that the length of time, from the beginning of man till the end of the world, hath been, and shall be measured by the severall lives of seven men: and, that there was never houre from mans creation to the generall resurrection, but some one of these seven men did or shall live in it. Adam lived to see Methuselah; Methuselah was alive in Sems time: Sem died not till Jacob was born: Jacob lived till Amram Moses his father was born: Amram expired not till Ahijah the Shilonite lived: Ahijah lived with Elijah: Elijah shall live till the end of the world: Therefore they thought Elijah was not burnt, is not dead. But first, the Papists themselves say, that Elijah shall be slain by Antichrist, before the end of world: Therefore this maketh not for them. Secondly, the Jews might have tucked up the time shorter, on this fashion: Adam lived in the dayes of Enoch, and Enoch to the end of the world. And so their number of seven might be reduced unto two. But let us leave these Rabbinicall speculations concerning Elijah; and say somewhat of him, not as he was in a Paradise of phansie, but as he was with our blessed Saviour on the mount, at that glorious transfiguration. And this I set down for certain; No passage in the Gospels proveth demonstratively, that his bodie was immortall. It is true,

[z] *De Romano Pontifice* 3. 6.

[y] *Bibliotheca Sancta lib.* 2. *pag.* 65.

it is said of Elijah and of Moses, ὀφθέντες δόξῃ, *they appeared in glory*: which apparition I hold to be *true*, and *reall*; though *temporarie*. They were [a] *seen in glorie*, saith Montanus. I adde, that the glorie of their souls could not be seen by the bodily eyes of the Apostles; and that the Apostles could not know them by their souls, but by their bodies. And, questionlesse, the bodily glory was meant, and aimed at. Yet none of this can extort a necessarie argument, that the bodies of Moses, or Elijah, were immortall, or impassible.

[a] *Visi in gloria.*

First, concerning Moses, Del Rio, *Magicarum Disquisitionum 2. Quæst. 26. Sect. 2.* saith, *It is not improbable, but that Moses appeared in an aeriall bodie.* Indeed Tertullian cometh somewhat neare to Del Rio (though the Jesuite cite him not) [a] *Moses appeared in the similitude of flesh which he had not received: for the denomination is taken from the better part.* But, *He is called Moses from his soul, which being the better part, and present, gives the denomination,* saith Del Rio. True, say I, where both matter and form are joyned in one: where there is a *COMPOSITUM, An unitie framed of a dualitie, A τὸ σύνολον.* *All the souls which came into Egypt, &c.* Genes. 46. 27. is spoken of such, as then consisted both of souls and bodies.

[a] *Moses apparuit in imagine carnis nondum recepta: nam à parte potiore facienda est denominatio.*

Secondly, I confesse, Abraham, Dives, and Lazarus are so called, though their bodies were separated then from them. Yet let Del Rio give me a Scripture-instance, where ever any one man or humane soul in an aeriall bodie, is called that partie whose soul it is. The triviall objection of Samuel I purposely balk (becauſe I am so farre flown out alreadie) standing upon this, that either true Samuel appeared not, or, if he did, he appeared in his own bodie.

The question which Alexander asked of the first man of the Gymnosophists, was, Whether the dead or the living made the greater number? He answered, The living: For the dead (said he) are no more men. The reason of his answer, is grounded on these Aphorismes; That the soul is not man: That the bodie is not man: That both soul and bodie do concurre to make a man. Neither doth Christs divine reason contradict any part of this, when he avoucheth, That God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. For Christ spake of the souls onely, or of souls which should have bodies at the resurrection; and the Gymnosophist, of men consisting of souls and bodies, who are properly to be termed living men: whereas separated souls, though living, are not truly living men.

Augustine, *de Civit. Dei, 19. 3.* hath it thus, out of the great Marcus Varro: *In the nature of man are two things; soul, and bodie: That the soul is farre better and more excellent then the bodie, he doubteth not: but whether the soul onely be the man, so that the bodie is but as the horse is to the rider; he enquireth. For the horse-*

horſeman is not the man and the horſe, but the man onely: yet he is called an horſeman, in reference to the riding of his horſe. Ludovicus Vives cometh in like a baſie bodie; and he, from Gellius, Marcellus, and Servius; and they, from Ennius and Virgil, will maintain that an *horſeman* is taken for an *horſe*, and an *horſe*, called an *horſeman*. I anſwer, Virgil followed Ennius his antique phraſe, and both of them Poeticall licence. But Varro uſed proper Philoſophicall terms; whileſt their language is improper, and in it ſelf both abſurd and untrue. S. Auguſtine out of Varro ſtill proceedeth; *Or whether the bodie onely be the man; being ſemblable to the ſoul, as the cup is to the potion: For the cup, and the potion contained in the cup, are not together called the cup: but the cup onely is called a cup, becauſe it is fit to hold the potion.* Vives here again cometh in with his over-nice exception, and criticiſm: [b] *That which men drink* (ſaith he) *is termed a cup, eſpecially by the Poets:*

Poculáque inventis Achelöia miſcuit unis:

his meaning being, that *he did mingle wine in the cups of Acheloius his framing.* I anſwer, that the *cups* in that place, are exactly diſtinguiſhed from the *wine* in them, and are not taken (*quatenus pocula*) for the liquor in them. Secondly, if any one hath at any time ſo uſed the word; it is Metaphorically, and not in proprietie of language. For he could not mingle wine *with*, but *in* the cups: nor did he properly mingle the cups with the wine.

[b] *Eſt etiam poculum id quod potatur, præſertim apud poetas.*

I paſſe from the ſecond interruption of Vives, to S. Auguſtine, out of Varro ſtill; *Or whether neither ſoul alone, nor bodie alone, but both together, be man: of which man the part is either the ſoul or the bodie; but he wholly conſiſteth of both, to be a man: as we call two horſes joyned together BIGAS; whereof either is part of the pair or couple; but neither is the pair or couple, but both harneſſed together.* In the end, *Varro reſolveth*, ſaith S. Auguſtine, *That neither the ſoul, nor the bodie, but both ſoul and bodie together is the man. And ſo the chief bleſſednesse of man conſiſteth in the good both of ſoul and bodie.* Which opinion is a divine truth; and S. Auguſtine approveth it, as may be gathered by his whole diſcourſe, and by the beginning of the fifth chap. of that book. So it was not the true Moſes, unleſſe the very ſoul and the very bodie of Moſes were preſent.

Yet Aquinas, 3. *part. quæſt.* 45. thinketh that Moſes appeared not in his own bodie: which Suarez confuteth by theſe authorities; S. Hierom, on Matth. 17. S. Auguſtine, *de Mirab. ſacræ Scripturæ*, 3. 10. which is followed by Scotus, *in 4. ſenten. diſtinct.* 43. Hieronymus Natalis the Jeſuit, thinks he ſtrikes all ſure: for amongſt his curious coſtly pictures upon the foure Goſpels; he picturing out the tranſiguration of our Saviour, bringeth in Moſes with horns on his head; to deſigne, that it

was

was the ſame Moſes, and the ſame bodie which Moſes had on the mount; according to the Vulgat, Exod. 34. 29. *Ignorabat Moſes quòd cornuta eſſet facies ſua:* that is, according to Natalis his opinion, *Moſes knew not that he had horns:* and verſ. 30. *Viderunt filii Iſrael cornutam faciem Moſis:* that is, according to the ſame mans phanſie, *The Iſraelites ſaw Moſes his horns:* though intruth the words may be farre better tranſlated. And ſo verſ. 35. Was not the Jeſuits face made of horn, or rather of braſſe, who publiſhed in ſo ſeeing and cleare-ſighted an age, ſuch an ignorant conceit, with ſuch boldneſſe; when indeed the words in the Originall, as they are tranſlated by their own interlinearie, are onely thus; *Promicuiſſet cutis facierum ejus, The skin of his face was ſleek:* and in the margin is, *Reſplendebat, did ſhine:* which is alſo uſed in the Tranſlation of Vatablus? Likewiſe, in the two other before-recited places, the ſame phraſe is uſed. The Septuagint have it, Καὶ Μωϋσῆς οὐκ ἤδει ὅτι δεδόξασται ἡ ὄψις τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ [c] *Moſes knew not that the ſplendour of his face and countenance was glorified*, as Vatablus tranſlateth the Seventy; Which, he ſaith, more fully expreſſeth the Hebrew, and is accordingly followed by the Apoſtle, 2. Cor. 3. 7. *for the glorie of his countenance.* Indeed the Original קָרַן, doth properly ſignifie an horn: from whence קָרַן, is *ſplendere, radiare, fulgere, to ſhine. Becauſe* (ſaith Vatablus from a learned Jew, *when man beholdeth earneſtly, and intentively, the Sunne, or any luminous bodie; the rayes ſeem to be ſent forth of it, like horns, in ſome ſort. But* (ſaith Vatablus) *out of the falſe, or ill-underſtood verſion of the Vulgat, they, who were no linguiſts, made the people falſly beleeve, that Moſes had two horns on his head; which is moſt falſe.* So farre Vatablus, though a man of their own, againſt the brainſick faction of the Jeſuit; who will maintain the people in any errour, if it be old; rather then ſuffer reformation. The Caldee hath it, *Multiplicatus eſt ſplendor gloriæ vultûs Moſis, The brightneſſe of Moſes his face increaſed in glory more and more:* Cornelius à Lapide the Jeſuit, though he ſtrive for the truth of the Vulgat, yet ſaith, *Moſes had no horns in his forehead;* [d] *as painters place on him.* Little perhaps did he think, that his fellow-Jeſuit Hieronymus Natalis was one of theſe painters; yea and that in one of the coſtlyeſt editions of the ſtorie of the Goſpels, that ever was ſet forth. But the wiſer and more ſuccinct Sa, hath it, *HORNY,* [e] *that is, gliſtering: in the Hebrew, reſplendent.* And Cajetan, better then he, [f] *In the litterall ſignification we have nothing to do with horn, though perchance there is ſome alluſion to it by a Metaphor.*

Concerning which Moſes his face, I will end with two obſervations.

The firſt is a very idle one, out of Bellarmine, *De Sanctorum reliquiis* 2. 4. [g] *It is very credible, that the dead bodie of Moſes preſer-*

[c] *Ignorabat Moſes quòd glorificatus eſſet aſpectus faciei ejus.*

[d] *Vti effingunt ei pictores.*

[e] Cornuta, id eſt, radios emittens; Hebraicè, radians.

[f] Nihil cornutum, ad literam, ſignificatur &c.

[g] Valde credibile eſt, Moſis corpus, licèt mortuum, conſervâſſe adhuc ſplendorem vultûs, & decorem quem antea habebat; ſicut multis Sanctorum accidit.

preserved the radiant comelinesse and beauty of his face, which he had in life: a rare thing (saith he) and such as hath happened to many of the Saints. But he nameth no Saint: And if he did, we should hardly believe him. And Moses himself died privately: and was buried secretly: no man saw him dying or dead. I acknowledge that some of the Ancients have inclined to this, *viz.* that Moses his face did shine all his life time, when he spake to the people. So Ambrose, *in Psal.* 118.[k] *So long as Moses lived, and spake to the people, he had a vail before his face*: not after death, as Bellarmine thinks probable. Besides, the Apostle, 2. Corinth. 3. 7. termeth it δόξαν καταργουμένην *the glorie of his countenance, which was to be done away*: Therefore it continued not after death; if it did till then, whensoever he spake to the people. And our late translation seemeth in part to accord, Exod. 34. 33. *Till Moses had done speaking with them, he put a vail on his face*: Yet the word *Till*, is not in the originall: but it may be probably expounded, That when Moses had done speaking, he put a vail on his face (for so the Hebrew, Greek, and Latine runne:) And though Moses ordinarily put off the vail, when he went to speak with God; and put it on, when he returned: yet once, and at the first of all, he might speak unto the people with face open, for more reverence and majestie.

The second observation is from Origen, *Homil.* 12. *in Exod. circa medium*; and it is a good one. *In the Law* (saith he) *Moses his face was glorified, though vailed: but his hand put into his bosome WAS LEAPROUS AS SNOW, Exod.* 4. 6.[l] *In his shining countenance was a figure of the Law: by his hands are works signified. Now because no man can be justified by the works of the Law, his hand was leprous.—His face was glorified, but vailed: therefore his words were full of knowledge, yet secret, and hidden.—Yea, in the Law, Moses had onely a glorified face: hands and feet were unglorified:—for Moses also put off his shoes, that an other, in after times, might have the bride:*[m] *and she be called to this day the house of the unshod.—*[l] *But in the Gospels all Moses is wholly glorified.—It seemeth also to me, that Moses rejoiceth in this point: because himself in a sort, now layeth aside his vail, being converted to Christ, when these things are plainly fulfilled, which he foretold.*

By which glorification you cannot necessarily interpret such a glorification as the Saints shall have after judgement, which never shall have end, where [m] *corruptible shall put on incorruption* immutable: but onely of a temporarie glorification: for Moses layd down his bodie again, as is held most probably.

The author of that book, which is intituled *Altercatio Synagogæ & Ecclesiæ, cap.* 22. (S. Paul and Gamaliel being interlocutours) thus; *Jesus Christ after his transfiguration*[n] *buried Moses.* A strange honour, (if true) that the same, who was buried

[k] *Quamdiu vixit Moses, & alloquebatur populum, velamen habuit in facie.*

[l] *In vultu ejus forma legis: in manu opera designantur.*

[m] *Et illa vocaretur domus discalceati usque in hodiernum diem.*

[l] *In Evangeliis autem Moses totus glorificatur ex integro. Gaudere etiam mihi pro hoc videtur Moses, quia & ipse quodammodo nunc deposuit velamen, conversus ad Dominum, cum evidenter, quæ prædixit, implentur.*

[m] 1. Cor. 15. 53.

[n] *Mosi corpus sepulturæ commendavit.*

ried by God himself in the Old Testament, should be thus glorified for a while, and after buried by Christ himself in the New Testament.

Furthermore, that there is no absolute necessitie, that either Moses or Elias (though they were seen in glorie) had immortall and impassible bodies by the transfiguration; appeareth by this, That our blessed Saviour himself, after that his transfiguration, had a mortall bodie, and did die: especially, if we consider, that his glorie was greater then theirs; as the *Masters* is above the *Servants*; and the *Lords*, above the *Attendants*.

Barradas on the transfiguration, saith, [o] *Christ would have his servants present, transfigured as well as himself, and adorned with singular glorie and majestie: as at marriages and other festivall dayes, the nobilitie richly clad do wait on Kings.* Tertullian, *adversus Marcionem, cap.* 22. saith, *Moses and Elias were seen* [p] *equally bright and glorious.* Luke 9.29. Ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον: *As he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered.* [q] *Let no man imagine* (saith Hierom) *that our Saviour lost the nature of a true bodie; onely he converted the outward form and fashion all into brightnes.* The like may I say of Moses and Elias; if they had their glorie by redundance from Christs glorie, as Suarez maintaineth: and then there is no necessitie, nor indeed great likelihood, that Christs glorious transfiguration should leave to himself a mortall bodie; and they should be by him then invested in eternall tabernacles of incorruptible flesh.

Now as I have clearely declared my judgement, that it holdeth not demonstratively from any *puncto*, that Elias at the transfiguration had an unchangeably glorious estate of bodie: so I hold it very probable, that Elias did never die properly; but was changed at his rapture; and, at his ingresse into heaven, enjoyed a truly glorified bodie; and both unto the time of Christs transfiguration, and then, and ever since enjoyeth, and liveth in flesh incorruptible; not *Animall*, but *Spirituall*, as the blessed Saints shall have after the end of the world.

If any one think to choke me with my former words, That Christs glorie was greater then the glorie of his servants; And therefore, if Elias had an immortall bodie, Christ must have one also; which he had not: I answer, That the hypostaticall union of the Divine Nature to the Humane in Christ, was at all times of greater glorie, then the glorified estate of the Saints shall be after the resurrection.

Secondly, as *intensively* Christs glorie was greater then Elijahs, though it was eclipsed by Christs voluntarie condescent, that he might accomplish the work of our redemption: so *extensively*, at the instant of the transfiguration, I doubt not, but the bodily glorie of Christ was as farre above his servants glorie, as the light of the sunne surpasseth the light of lesser starres.

[o] *Transfigurationi sua transfiguratos, gloriâque ac singulari majestate ornatos, voluit Christus adesse servos suos: sic solent in nuptiis festisq; aliis diebus nobiles viri, pretiosis ornati vestibus, Regibus adesse.*

[p] *In consortio claritatis.*

[q] *Nemo putet, Salvatorem veritatem corporis amisisse; externam tantùm speciem permutavit splendore.*

ſtarres. Therefore, all things conſidered, Chriſts bodily glorie was greater then Elijahs, though Elijahs was *immortall*, and Chriſts then *changeable* and *mortall*.

Bellarmine, in his Apologie againſt the judicious Monitorie preface of King James, eſteemeth it as [p] *much to be admired at*, that the learned King ſaid, *Enoch and Elias are now glorified in heaven*. Many things indeed might Bellarmine learn by his Majeſtie, which are *& laudanda, & valde admiranda, both to be praiſed and wondred at*: but, taking *valde admirandum* in the worſer ſenſe, I ſay, his wonder is full of ignorance and malice. Wherefore, omitting much of what that really-unanſwerable Biſhop hath copiouſly alledged, I ſay, It is no ſuch ſtrange matter, to ſay, or beleeve, that Enoch and Elias have glorified bodies. And yet here, firſt of all, I will ingenuouſly confeſſe that a man, both in ſoul and in a corruptible bodie, may be in the third heaven: becauſe S. Paul elſe might have known, that himſelf was not in the third heaven in his bodie: but his doubting and neſciencie (2. Cor. 12. 2, &c. *Whether in the bodie, I cannot tell, or whether out of the bodie, I cannot tell; God knoweth*) proveth that either might have been. The disjunctive might elſe have been ſpared, if it could have been done onely one way: Therefore it is poſſible unto the Almightie, that Elias might or may have a paſſive mortall bodie, though he were rapt into heaven, and there be at this preſent. But, *A poſſe ad eſſe non valet conſequentia*: and the reaſons and authoritie which place Elias in heaven, in an unpaſſible bodie, are more ponderous and numerous, then theirs which embrace the contrarie.

If it be objected, that Elias went not up into the third heaven, becauſe he was carried up in a whirlwinde: and whirlwindes reach not to the third heaven: I anſwer, By the ſame cavill they may ſay, Our Saviour aſcended not into heaven, when *a cloud received him out of their ſight*, Act. 1. 9. becauſe clouds pierce not to the higheſt heaven. But we muſt diſtinguiſh between things *ordinarie* and *extraordinarie*. Both the whirlwinde and the cloud had ſomewhat in them above the common level of nature, and were not meerly elementarie, but adapted to higher and diviner uſes, then common clouds or whirlwindes.

I remove this paſſant tabernacle of diſcourſe from an objection unto the ſtanding manſion of our great Adverſaries confeſſions. Suarez, *in tertiam partem Summ. quæſt. 53. artic. 3.* confeſſeth in this manner: [q] *Some men are in hell both ſoul and bodie, before the generall reſurrection: as Dathan, and Abiram, and the like.* He is ſeconded by Peter Morales, another Jeſuit, in his fifth book on the firſt chapter of S. Matthew, Tract. 1. This opinion is ſomewhat minced by Ribera, upon the words,

[p] *Valde admirandum.*

[q] *Sunt in inferno aliqui homines, corpore & animâ, ante generalem reſurrectionem; ut Dathan, Abiram, & ſimiles.*

Revel. 19.20. *These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone:* who hath his second also, *viz.* Blasius Viegas; for they say, *Korah, Dathan, and Abiram were swallowed up alive; but then the earth closed, and they died, and their souls onely were carried into hell.* The like they say of Antichrist, and his fore-runner. But this nicetie is contradicted by the Vulgat, which to them is authenticall: Num. 16.33. *Descenderunt vivi in infernum:* so also in the thirtieth verse; and so the Interlinearie rightly readeth it, according to the Hebrew. And if *infernum* did signifie the *grave*, in the case of Korah and his complices, as it doth not (for then it had been no such extraordinarie miracle, for people alive to be swallowed up by the earths rupture; since many people, yea, whole cities have often been so punished, and came to destruction: but *they were for a signe*, Numb. 26.10. that is, *for an example*; that others should not murmure and rebell against Gods Ministers, as the Genevean Note on the place, soundly, and pertinently, and deeply interpreteth:) yet concerning Antichrist and his false-propher, mentioned by them, it cannot be so: for it is said most punctually, Revel. 19.20. τὼ δύω ἐβλήθησαν οἱ δύο εἰς λίμνην πυρὸς καιομένου ἐν θείῳ· οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου· *Vivi missi sunt hi duo in stagnum ignis ardentis, & sulphuris, These both were cast alive into a lake of burning fire and brimstone*, as it is in their Vulgat. Montanus varieth it thus, *In stagnum ardens in sulphure, Into a lake burning in brimstone.* They did not descend *to the grave, to hell, to the lake of fire, exclusively*; coming onely to the brink but, *they descended into hell, into the lake of fire*, they were plunged into it. Therefore they did not die by the way, or at the gates of hell; but actually and really entred into those fierie mansions, or burning chambers. For both Ribera and Viegas will be ashamed to say, that the grave burneth with fire and brimstone; which they must be forced to say, if they continue to hold, that Antichrist and his fore-runner leave their bodies in the grave.

Andreas Cæsariensis (saith Viegas on Revel. 13.) *thinketh that Antichrist and his fore-runner shall not die, but with incorruptible bodies shall descend alive into hell.* And as concerning Korah, and his fellow-mutiners; though some think, it cannot be understood literally, of the nethermost hell; because it is said, Numb. 16. 33. *They, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit*: but their goods, and their houses went not to hell: therefore not their bodies. Yet I answer, The Text is too much wrung, and strained: for by the like wrench, they may as well prove that their houses and goods were alive: the letter will bear one as well as the other, if they ground on some translation of the Seventie, for of the Originall I shall speak anon. But the true meaning is, They,

and

t *Ad sepulchrum, ad infernum, ad stagnum ignis exclusivè.*
ſ *Descenderunt in infernum, in stagnū ignis.*

t *Sed incorrupto corpore, vivos ad infernum descensuros.*

and all their things, came to that destruction, which in their nature they were capable of: their tents and goods were swallowed up and consumed; their bodies were hurried to their own places, not of rest (as is the common death of all men, till the judgement generall) but extraordinarily, they endured present punishment.

Our learned Doctour Raynolds, *Tom. 1. de libris Apocryphis, praelect. 81. pag. 973.* relateth, that Epiphanius, *in Ancorato*, held, Korah, Dathan, and their rebellious troups, [a] *descended living and quick into hell; their souls not disunited from their bodies; no remnant or part left behinde: but they all and wholly, souls and bodies, were delivered up to torment.* And thus that most learned Professour discourseth, [b] *They descended, with all things that were theirs, alive into hell, as it is in the Hebrew. What is meant by those words, All things? Their Tabernacles, houses, and goods. But I beleeve, the Papists will not say, that their houses and goods descended into the place of souls; but into the place of bodies. Therefore Moses denoteth the place of bodies, not of souls.* The honoured Doctour might also have considered, that it may be as well said, that their *bodies* went to *hell*, as their *souls* to the *sepulchre*; if the place of their descent had been understood onely of the receptacles of *bodies*, and not of *souls*. Secondly, (as I touched before) may not as well their bodies go to hell alive, as *they, and all that appertained to them, went down* (as the Seventie in Vatablus have it) *alive into the pit?* Thirdly, did their tabernacles, houses, beasts, and goods go down into their graves? Graves are not the proper places for tents, beasts and goods; but for humane bodies. Those terms of *locus corporum*, are obscure; and culled out purposely, for a starting-hole: whereas, if he had said, Moses denoted their sepulchres onely, and not hell (which he doth in effect afterward,) we may presse him with this, That they are much happier then other: for whereas others bring nothing into this world, nor carrie any thing out of it; these men went not to hell, in Moses his meaning, but carried with them, out of this world, their beasts, their goods, yea their very tents. But their *miserie* and *curse extraordinarie* is described, and not their *happinesse*.

Lastly, I could wish that the worthy Doctour had throughly weighed how divinely the Holy Writ discriminateth severall matters. Moses prophesied Numb. 16. 30. *If the earth swallow them up, with all that appertain unto them, and they go down quick into the pit, &c.* where you must interpret it, as if he had thus said, *The earth indeed shall swallow and cover alike both them and all their goods: but the persons themselves shall go down alive* (*VIVENTES, living*, as the Interlinearie hath it; *vivi*, as Doctour Raynolds) *lower, even to the pit.* And accordingly it came to passe, vers. 32. *The earth swallowed them up, and their houses, and all*

[a] *Descendisse viventes in orcum, non corporibus solutis, neque reliquiis traditis, aut parte; sed totis ipsis; cum corpore & anima, traditis in supplicium.*

[b] *Descenderunt ipsi, cum omnibus quae ipsorum erant, vivi in inferorum; quomodo habetur in Hebraico contextu. Quae sunt illa omnia? Tabernacula, & domus, & opes ipsorum. Atqui non dicent (credo) Pontificii, domos eorum & facultates omnes in locum animarum descendisse, sed in locum corporum.*

all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods: where you ſee, the earth ſwallowed all alike; the chief leaders, and their goods; the aſſociates of Korah, and all their goods. Yet for the perſons themſelves, it is ſaid in the next verſe, by way of diſtinction, remarkably; *They, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit*: which you cannot poſſibly interpret of their goods, and tabernacles: (for they never were alive; and never could go down alive, no not to the grave, or to any pit whatſoever) but of the principals, and the acceſſaries; *viz.* the chief rebels, and their partakers: for diverſe *men* appertained to them, as is apparent verſ. 32. and therefore, what our Engliſh tranſlation hath ſomewhat dubiouſly, and ambiguouſly, *They, and all that appertained to them*, (where it is not ſignificantly enough expreſſed, whether men onely, or men and goods are compriſed under the words) the Interlinearie hath exactly, and truly determined, [y] *They deſcended, and all the men which lived with them, alive into hell*: and Vatablus, [z] *And both they deſcended and as many men as were their partakers, living and quick into hell*: the *quot quot* having reference to men onely, not to other things: for then it would have been *viventia*, and not *viventes*: and therefore in the margin of Vatablus, it is thus varied, [a] *All they who belonged to them*. Where the maſculine gender deſigneth out the men onely to go alive into the pit. To be plain, I care for no opinion, as it is an opinion of Bellarmines, or of the Pontificians; but if they light upon a truth, I will accept of it, not as *theirs*, but as *true*: [b] *Socrates ſhall be my companion, Plato my friend, truth my familiar friend*: and *Vel veritas, vel*

——— Virtus & in hoſte probatur.
Or truth, or any vertue do I like,
Even in an enemie that would me ſtrike.

And I hold Bellarmines opinion true, That Korah, his partiſans and companie, deſcended alive into hell. And that שְׁאוֹל in Numbers 16.30, and 33 verſes, ſignifieth hell properly. [c] *You ſhall diſcern by the manifeſt circumſtances of the place, that Moſes meaneth ſome place under the earth fitted or appointed as receptacles of bodies, not of ſouls*, ſaith Doctour Raynolds.

Herein I muſt needs diſſent. And firſt, I ſay, What is this [d] *place of bodies*? It muſt be either the grave, or hell; or let him deſigne us out a third place. A third place he cannot name; eſpecially for humane bodies. Some held concerning infants, *That in regard of their innocencie they are to have eternall life: but becauſe they were not baptized, they ſhould not be with Chriſt in his kingdome*. But Auguſtine ſaith, That Chriſt himſelf confuted [e] *this new-invented middle or third manſion*: and as he ſaid a little before, more generally, [f] *It is impoſſible for any man to be in any middle place, but he muſt needs be with the devil, who is not with Chriſt*: ſo do I ſay of this *Locus*

[y] *Deſcenderunt ipſi, & omnes, qui eis, viventes in infernum.*
[z] *Deſcenderúntque ipſi, & quotquot ad eos pertinebant, viventes in infernum.*
[a] *Omnes, qui eis.*
[b] *Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato; ſed magìs amica Veritas.*
[c] *Ex manifeſtis loci circumſtantiis intelligetis, notari à Moſe locum ſubterraneum,* corporum, *non* animarum.
[d] *Locus corporum.*
[e] *—iſtam (neſcio quam) medietatem.* De peccator. Merit. & Remiſ. l. 28.
[f] *Nec eſt ullus alli medius locus, ut poſſit eſſe, niſi cum diabolo, qui non eſt cum Chriſto.*

cus corporum, It is either hell, or the grave: *Tertium locum penitus ignoramus*; *We know no third place.* The Papists erre, to establish a Purgatorie for the soul, besides hell and heaven: And Doctour Raynolds doth not well, to mention so often a *Locus corporum*; where he ought to name, Where it is, and What bodies go into it.

Secondly, it is plain, that their souls did sinne; their souls were punished, and went down to hell. Doth not the Apostle S. Jude (vers. 11.) speak of such, as *perished in the gainsaying of Korah*; — *to whom*, not the wo of a sudden death is denounced, but (vers. 13.) *the blackenesse of darkenesse for ever is reserved?* doth not the place stand fair for the damnation of Korah and his fellows? Though Doctour Raynolds minceth it in this doubtfull manner: [d] *I denie not but their souls, if they died obstinate in their wicked rebellion, were adjudged to the hell where Dives was.* Again, when the Scripture saith, *Si creationem creaverit Dominus*, (Numb. 16. 30.) *If the Lord shall make a new thing*, or *a strange thing*, as new almost, as strange to sight almost, as is the creation (for I take so much to be implyed in that unusuall phrase;) what reason hath that grave Doctour to say, [e] *That which is properly meant by the words, IF THEY GO DOWN QUICK INTO HELL, is nothing else, but that the horrible and dreadfull judgement of God, divinely shall be inflicted on them, viz. in such sort, that whereas others first die, and then are buried, these shall be buried (as it were) alive.* Why so reservedly and cautelously is it added, *As it were, alive?* Again, [f] *It was the place of bodies, and not of souls, into which Korah, Dathan, and Abiram descended:* (as if their souls were in the place appointed for bodies) which he further parallelleth with the burying alive of the deflowred Vestall virgins: though he ought to distinguish between the extraordinary miraculous hand of God, and the ordinary justice of men in such cases. And the Vestall virgins were farre longer ere they died, then Korah and his companie, ere they were swallowed up.

Let the judicious reader ponder these words of that famous Doctour, *Is nothing else*: and *Shall be buried, as it were, alive*: and, *Korah, Dathan, and Abiram descended not into the place of souls* (though the souls of all wicked men do so: and their souls, by his reason, should have more priviledge then other wicked mens:) and, I dare say, he will think that Doctour Raynolds might more safely have held the other opinion, That their souls and bodies went alive to hell properly so called.

That Moses denoteth the place of bodies, I denie not: for even that place is in hell, for all the bodies of the wicked in due time, and for these mens bodies, extraordinarily, before the generall judgement.

[d] *Non inficior, quin eorum animæ, si fuerint mortui pertinaces in scelerata sua obstinatione, adjudicatæ sint inferis; cum Divite.*

[e] *Illud quod propriè notatur in verbis—Descenderint in infernum, viventes, nihil est aliud, quàm, horribile & tremendum judicium Dei divinitus illis inflictum iri: ut, cùm alii priùs moriantur quàm sepeliantur; ipsi quasi vivi sepeliantur.*

[f] *Locus fuit corporum; non animarum, in quem descenderunt Corah, Dathan, & Abiram.*

But I am loth to say, Moses meant not the place of souls: I am loth to entertain a thought, That the Rebels themselves did repent; for, if they did so, they are saved: I would be loth to flee from rationable probabilitie, to possibilitie; which hath a farre-stretched almightie arm; and to say, as he doth, [e] *It may be that some of them were not faultie, or, if they were, repented.* That they repented who were swallowed up alive, seems not agreeable to S. Jude; who (ver. 11.) pronounceth a fearfull wo against such as are like unto them, and perished in the gainsaying of Korah: In which wo, not temporall bodily punishment alone, but eternall torment of the soul is included. Compare the words with 2. Pet. 2. 12. Moreover, none dares denie the possibilitie of repentance; but who can think it probable, That God would send such an extraordinarie punishment on such as were innocent, or repented; when as the children of that Luciferian Arch-rebel Korah, were exempted from that destruction? Numb. 26. 11. *Notwithstanding the children of Korah died not:* yea, were eminent and famous among the Levites; *Were over the work of the service, keepers of the gates of the Tabernacle, and their fathers were over the hoste of the Lord: — and the Lord was with* them, 1. Chron. 9. 19. &c. And they were either excellent Musicians, or Singers, or Pen-men for Divine Service; as may be collected from many Psalmes, intituled, *To the sonnes of Korah*; as, Psal. 42. Psal. 44. Psal. 87. And when the Scripture saith, *They descended alive into the pit*, I would be loth to varie the phrase as he doth, [h] *If they died in their obstinacie.* I denie not, but in a large sense, they may be said *to die*: and the Scripture saith, They should not *die the common death of all men*, Numb. 16. 29. yet also, *They descended alive into the pit:* which cannot be better reconciled, then to say, The state of their bodies was changed; immortalitie swallowed up their mortalitie, in the act of their *descending*, or *passion* rather, if you will so call it. There was no true separation between their souls and their bodies; and therefore they died not: their *change* notwithstanding may be reputed for *a death*; which perhaps also shall be the case of all the wicked, who shall be alive at Christs second and glorious coming; and shall be certainly the estate of the righteous, who shall be alive at that great and dreadfull day.

I would be loth also to say, That nothing else is noted by the words, but that, Whereas others die first, and then are buried; these men were buried alive, or as live men: that I may passe by his amphibolous phrase, [i] *I denie not, but their souls, if they died obstinate in their wicked rebellion, were sentenced to hell with Dives.* Why doth he not specialize where those *inferi* are? and in what place Dives is? or did they go to a para-

[e] *Fieri potest ut quidam eorum aut affines illi culpæ non fuerint; aut si fuerint, pœnitentiam egerint.*

[h] *Si sint mortui pertinaces.*

[i] *Non inficior, quin eorum animæ, si sint mortui pertinaces in scelerata sua obstinatione, adjudicatæ sint inferis cum Divite.*

parabolicall hell? for he could not be ignorant that many hold that historie of Dives to be but a parable.

The truth and summe of all is this; By divine power extraordinarie, the houses, or tents, the beasts, and the goods of Korah and his complices, were separated and secluded from the use of men; were swallowed up, and covered in the earth, and came to that end and destruction which they were capable of: No word of God saith expressely, no inference or reason evinceth, no probabilitie induceth us to think, that their tents, household-stuffe, or utensils were alive, or that they, yea, or the beasts of these conspiratours, went into the graves of them, (if graves they had any;) much lesse, did such trash descend into hell, that place of *torment*, that *Tophet* prepared for wicked men, that *Deep*, excruciating and affrighting both the Devil and his Angels. That tents, goods, and faculties should go thither, to what purpose were it? but God doth nothing, unlesse it be to some great end or purpose: therefore to the lowest hell their goods descended not. But as concerning the men themselves, it is plainly said, That both the earth did open its mouth, and swallowed them up, (even as it did their tents, or beasts, or goods:) and after that, most distinctly, that they went down alive into שְׁאוֹל: but their souls could not go into the *graves*, and there reside; and their bodies might go into *hell*, and there reside; therefore שְׁאוֹל, must needes there be expounded, not of the *grave*, nor of *locus corporum* (as Doctour Raynolds phraseth it) but of the *hell of the damned*, of the *locus animarum*, which place also must be the receptacle for all humane bodies of the wicked, after the day of doom and retribution; and may be the prison of those reprobate both souls and bodies, whom God miraculously thither adjudgeth, as he did this rebellious rout.

Though Lyra, cited by Doctour Raynolds, thinks the grave is meant, because *it is appointed for all men to die, and after that cometh judgement*: yet I have many wayes proved, that by especiall dispensation, and by extraordinarie priviledge, some may receive favour, beyond the common rule or course of nature: and contrarily, I doubt not, but upon so great a commotion, and furious rebellion, God could, and did, by way of exemplarie punishment, punish these men bodily, before the usuall time; and sent their bodies to hell, before the generall judgement.

If Cajetan, and Hieronymus ab Oleastro, cited by that Reverend Doctour, expound שְׁאוֹל for the *grave*; yet they want both weight and age, to put down Epiphanius, before recited, and many other Ancients, who place their bodies in *hell*.

I accept then of Suarez his confession before mentioned, and agree with him, That Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, are now,

both in souls and bodies, in hell. And upon this ground, I thus work: If they be there, they are there to be punished, and are punished: if they burn in hell-fire, they have no longer mortall bodies: But as at the last day, the bodies of the wicked, that are alive then, shall put on immortalitie; so the bodies of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, were not properly separated from their souls; but were changed, and fitted for such places of punishments, in the instant of their descent: and so they descended alive into the pit of hell.

Then why may not Enoch and Elias be in immortall and glorified bodies, since they were assumed up into heaven? especially, since Suarez himself again ingenuously confesseth, [k] *It is convenient, yea proper to nature, that a glorified soul should be united to an immortall and glorified bodie.* And the souls of Enoch and Elias are now glorified, by the like acknowledgement of our learned Adversaries.

k *Anima glorioſa connaturale eſt uniri corpori immortali & glorioſo.*

Again, where the souls of Enoch and Elias are, there also are their bodies: But their souls are in the highest heaven. For our Saviour saith, John 17.24. *Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am.* And John 12.26. *Where I am, there shall also my servant be.* But Christ is in the highest heavens: Therefore both Enoch and Elias are, with their bodies, in the third heaven: unlesse you can say, They were not given by God to Christ, and were not Christs servants. Now since they are there in their bodies; it is very unlikely, that they should be there some thousands of yeares in bodies mortall and unglorified. Hierom, *ad Pammachium*, avoucheth, [l] *They enjoy and have the fruition of the Deitie, and are fed with heavenly food:* which is not meat for mortall bodies.

l *Fruuntur divino conſortio, & cibo cæleſti.*

Besides, S. Hierom, *Tom. 3. Epist. pag. 189. in Epistola ad Minerium & Alexandrum*, citeth Theodorus Heracleotes, instancing in Enoch and Elias, as carried to heaven, and as having overcome death. And Apollinarius fully agreeth with the other, with this addition onely, that Enoch and Elias have now glorified bodies. Dorotheus, *in Synopsi de Elia*, thus, [m] *Who was on the earth as other men; now, as a spirit, liveth in heaven with the Angels:* therefore he hath not a mortall bodie.

m *Qui humi incedebat; inſtar ſpiritus, cum Angelis in cœlis agit.*

Again, in most of the generall promises that God hath made, he giveth some instance or other, to be as it were a taste of what shall succeed, lest mens hearts should fail, in expectancie of that, whereof they see no kinde of proof. As for example, because it was promised, that there shall be a resurrection, it was figured, not onely more obscurely in Isaac his rising up from the Altar; in the drawing of Joseph out of the pit; in the Whales deliverie of Jonah; in Samsons breaking from the cords; in Daniels escape from the lions; in the waters yeelding and giving up Moses, to live in the Kings house, and

the

the like: but more evidently, by the reall, and temporarie raiſing up of divers dead, both in the Old and New Teſtament.

Likewiſe, the glorification of our bodies being determined by God, and by him promiſed; yea, Enoch himſelf propheſying, that *God cometh with ten thouſands of his Saints, to execute judgement upon all*, Jude 14, and 15 verſes; which is not, cannot be executed, without the glorifying of ſouls and bodies of his ſervants; we may well think, it pleaſed God to give to the old world a pledge or two of the generall glorification of the bodies of his Saints, by the particular performance of the ſame to the bodies of Enoch and Elias, whom he aſſumed up into heaven, by way of eſpeciall favour.

To this I may adde, That Enoch and Elijahs raptures being types of Chriſts aſcenſion, ſince Chriſt aſcended in a glorified and immortall bodie, the ſhadows muſt be like the ſubſtance: and therefore they aſcended in glorified immortall bodies.

Suarez is driven to a great exigent: *They were onely* (ſaith he) [a] *in a ſtate in which they might merit and increaſe in grace, till the time in which they were tranſlated: And as they were tranſlated, they were ſo confirmed in grace, that they can commit no ſinne: And to their old eſtate of meriting ſhall they return, when they ſhall live again amongſt men.* But who ever heard of ſuch turnings and returnings in any other men or Angels? or that their eſtate ſhall be changed from [o] *an eſtate wherein they cannot ſinne, to an eſtate in which they may ſinne?* and ſo backward: For ſuppoſing they ſhall live again, and die again; if they can merit, they can alſo ſinne whileſt they live among men: and ſo, when they die, and have their reward in heaven, this ſhall be no ſmall part of it, [p] *To have no power to ſinne.* But this opinion ſomewhat reſembleth the diverſified eſtate of devils, who *ſhall be ſaved after the generall judgement*, as Origen feigned and fabled; and which the Church hath branded for erroneous.

And now I ſee I have fallen, before I was aware, upon the fourth and laſt queſtion by me propounded, *Whether Enoch and Elias ſhall ever die, or do live with glorified bodies in the higheſt heavens?* which alſo I have anſwered at large, *That they never ſhall die, but do and ſhall live in glorified bodies.* Tertullian, I confeſſe, ſaid concerning Elias at the Transfiguration, [q] *He appeared in true fleſh which had never been ſeparated from it's ſoul:* and more punctually, *de Anima cap.* 50. [r] *Enoch and Elias were tranſlated: nor is their death recorded, or known; it being adjourned: they are kept and preſerved that they may die hereafter, and by their blood overthrow and extinguiſh Antichriſt*, as Baronius cites him. And the more common opinion of the Papiſts is, That

[a] —*in ſtatu merendi, & potuerunt in gratia creſcere, &c.*

[o] *An non poſſe peccare, ad poſſe peccare.*

[p] *Non poſſe peccare.*

[q] *Apparuit in veritate carnis nondum defunctæ.*

[r] *Translatus eſt Enoch & Elias, nec mors eorum reperta eſt: dilata ſcilicet: Moriturî reſervantur, ut Antichriſtum ſanguine ſuo extinguant.*

That they two ſhall be ſlain: and they prove it by Rev. 11. 7. *When the two witneſſes ſhall have finiſhed their teſtimonie, the beaſt that aſcendeth out of the bottomleſſe pit, ſhall overcome, and kill them.* The three other places of Scripture, on which Bellarmine built his third demonſtration, that Antichriſt is not come, becauſe Enoch and Elias are not yet come, are anſwered before. This laſt place and paſſage of Scripture, uſed by Bellarmine, *de Romano Pontif.* 3. 6. cometh now to be examined: and you ſhall finde it thus well winnowed by Biſhop Andrews, in his Anſwer to Cardinall Bellarmines Apologie, *Cap.* 11. That the *two witneſſes* are the two Teſtaments, as Beda, Primaſius, Auguſtinus, and Ticonius are Authours. S. Hilarius rejecteth Enoch, and puts Moſes in his room, and that very peremptorily: *Though many have ſubſtituted Jeremie in Enochs room,* ſaith Hilarie on Matth. Can. 20. S. Hierom, the next Father cited by Bellarmine, is not conſtant enough for Elias (which I touched at before:) and Rupertus, on Malach. 4. teſtifieth ſo much of Hierom: and Bullinger, *in Apocal. lib. 3. v. 3.* ſaith, *S. Hierom eſteemeth them to be Jews and Jewiſh hereticks, who think Elias ſhall come again.* Lactantius, cited by Bellarmine, in his Apologie, nameth neither Enoch, nor Elias. And Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, Origen, and Primaſius ſay nothing of Enoch. Hippolytus, for the two witneſſes, brings in three, one whereof is S. John the Divine: and indeed he is more likely to be one of the witneſſes, then Enoch; for unto him it was ſaid, Revel. 10. 11. *Thou muſt propheſie again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings:* but no ſuch thing was ſaid to Enoch. Others ſay, Elizeus ſhall be one of the two witneſſes. Hieronymus, ſaith, [r] *Unleſſe a man underſtand this place of the Revelation ſpiritually, he muſt needs ſettle and reſt on Jewiſh fables.* Maldonate on the 17 of Matthew, and his learned Interpreter, ſaith, It is ſo cleare a matter, that Moſes and Elias ſhall come, that none but a raſh and impudent man can denie it. Thus much Biſhop Andrews in his Anſwer to the place of the Revelation, againſt Bellarmines Apologie; who vaunted of a cloud of Fathers; which cloud is vaniſhed almoſt into nothing.

[r] *Niſi quis ſpiritualiter intelligat hunc locum Apocalypſeos, Judaicis ei fabulis acquieſcendum eſt.* In Epiſt. ad Marcellum.

Much more of great worth and conſequence hath that Reverend Biſhop, in the ſame 11 chapter, concerning Enoch and Elias, living in glorified bodies; to whom I referre the Reader. And this ſhall ſuffice to have ſpoken of Enoch, and of Elias, againſt Bellarmines third *demonſtration* (as he calleth it) that Antichriſt is not yet come. Every part and parcell of which proof is ſo weak, and ſo farre from concluding apodictically; that they ſcarce deſerve a place among probable arguments. And thus is the ſecond main branch of my anſwers made good and manifeſted, That ſome have been excepted from death, *viz.* Enoch and Elias; though it be objected, that

It

It is appointed for men to die. The third part of my answer followeth, That others also shall be excepted.

O Fountain of life, and preserver of men, to whom belong also the issues of death: I have deserved to die the first and second death, I have provoked thy long-suffering, I am no more worthy to be called thy sonne; Lord make me as one of thy hired servants, and put me to what labour, to what paine soever, within me, without me, so long as pleaseth thee: onely, I beseech thee for the blessed mediation of thy dearely beloved onely Sonne, Jesus Christ my Saviour, give me grace not to faint under the burthens appointed; and at the end of the day, at my lives end, vouchsafe to give me a penie among thy labourers, and eternall life among thy chosen. Amen.

CHAP. III.

1. *Some others hereafter shall be excepted from death.* The change *may be accounted, in a generall large sense, a kinde of* death. *The Papists will have a reall proper death: Aquinas, an incineration. This is disproved* 1. Thessal. 4. 17. *which place is handled at large. The rapture of the godly is* sine media morte, without death. *The resurrection is of all together. The righteous prevent not the wicked, in that.*

2. *By the words of the Creed is proved, that some shall never die. The same is confirmed by other places of Scripture, with the consent of S. Augustine, and Cajetan. The definitions* Ecclesiasticorum dogmatum, *of the sentences and tenents of the Church, leave the words doubtfully. Rabanus his exposition rejected.*

3. *The place of S. Paul,* 2. Corinth. 5. 4. *evinceth, That some shall not die. Cajetan with us, and against Aquinas. Dorotheus Estius, and Cornelius a Lapide the Jesuit, approve Cajetan. S. Augustine is on our side, and evinceth it by Adams estate before the fall; which state Bellarmine denieth not. Salmerons objections answered.*

4. *Some shall be exempted from death, as is manifested* 1. Corinth. 15. 51. *The place fully explicated. The common Greek copies preferred. The Greek reading* πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα,

θα, We shall not all sleep, *standeth with all truth, conveniencie, probabilitie, and sense. The other Greek,* πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, We shall therefore all of us sleep, *and the more different Vulgar,* Omnes quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur, Indeed we shall arise, but we shall not all be changed, *justly exploded, as adverse to sense.*

5. *The Pelagians, though accursed hereticks, yet held truely, That some shall not die. S. Augustine dubious. Others stick in his hesitancie. Yet other Fathers and late Writers are constant, That some shall be priviledged from death, yet, that* change *may be called a kinde of* death.

1. THe third main question being, *Whether Adam and his children, all and every one of them, without priviledge or exception, must and shall die?* I have first answered, and proved, that there may be an exception of some, who shall not die. Secondly, I have instanced in Enoch and Elias, That they have been excepted, and that they shall not die. I am now come to the third branch of my answer, That others also hereafter shall be excepted. In the avouchment of this truth consisteth the labour, till the end of this Chapter. And first of all, it must needs be acknowledged, That all and every one of those, who might have been, or have been, or shall be excepted, may yet be said, in a sort, to die. [a] *The change which shall be in the twinkling of an eye, shall be in the room and stead of death,* saith Aretius. [b] *The immutation of them who shall be suddenly changed, shall be a kinde of death,* saith Beza. Bosquier, in his *Terror Orbis*, maketh *rapture* to be a kinde of *death:* we may more safely and properly call that *sudden change*, by the name of *death*. For in this it shall be like death, That it shall take away from our bodies all corruptibilitie and mortalitie, together with the defects now annexed to them: and because it altereth, if not aboliſheth the former state or nature, it shall go for a kinde of death. But because this change doth not separate the soul from the bodie, doth not dissolve the *compositum*; we are bold to say, It is not a true, proper, reall death.

a *Locomutio erit momentanea commutatio.*
b *In illis qui repentè immutantur, immutatio illa erit species mortis.*

The Papists will not be content with this immutation; but urge a perfect naturall death, a very disjunct separation of the soul from the bodie.

Aquinas goeth further, and will have an incineration of the bodies; from which dust and ashes, incorruptible bodies shall arise.

But

But this is confuted by the Apoſtle, 1. Theſſ. 4. 17. Ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι, ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ἁρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἀέρα. [a] *We who remain alive, ſhall be hurried together in the clouds to meet the Lord in the aire*, as Montanus hath it. The Vulgat differeth but in word, not in ſenſe; [b] *We which are alive and remain, ſhall be caught up.* That the Apoſtle ſpeaketh not this of himſelf, and of his own perſon, is confeſſed. Oecumenius citeth Methodius his opinion thus; and addeth his reaſon, *For S. Paul was not alive corporally to that time.* But it cometh more home, if we ſay (as well we may) that the bleſſed Apoſtle S. Paul knew that himſelf was none of them, who were to endure alive on earth, till the day of the generall judgement; becauſe he ſaith, 2. Tim. 4. 6. *I am now readie to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.* Yea, 2. Theſſ. 2. 2. he exhorteth the ſame Theſſalonians, That though ſeducers ſhould pretend his meſſage, or his letter, yet they ſhould not beleeve that Chriſts day was at hand. His own time was at hand, but Chriſts day was not. The Engliſh tranſlation jumpeth verbally in the contradiction; *At hand*, and, *Not at hand.* The Originall varieth but a little; and that not in ſenſe, nor in the Verb it ſelf, but the Prepoſition: and Montanus hath the word, *inſtat*, by way of expoſition in both places. [c] *But he inſtanceth in his own perſon*, ſaith Methodius. That he ſpeaketh it onely of the godly, is alſo apparent by the context: for the word οἱ περιλειπόμενοι, *we the remainder*, ſheweth, that a few ſhall be left at that time: and if he had ſpoken of the wicked; perhaps, he would not have put in himſelf, and other holy ones; he would not have ſaid *Rapiemur*, *We ſhall be taken up*; but *Rapientur*, *They ſhall be taken up.* Again, when he ſaith, *Rapiemur cum illis*, *We ſhall be taken up with them*; who are meant in thoſe words, ſave they onely *who ſleep in Jeſus*, and *whom God will bring with him*, 1. Theſſ. 4. 14: which are not the wicked, but the godly onely. They are the *Saints*, with whom *the Lord cometh*, Jude ver. 14.

The Rhemiſts themſelves confeſſe, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of all the faithfull then living, when Chriſt cometh to the laſt judgement. *Diodorus* (as it is in Hierom) *ſaith, The Apoſtle* [e] *ſaid WE, that is, they who are juſt: out of whoſe number I am not excluded.* A powerfull reaſon may confirm this: becauſe the wicked will wiſh mountains to cover them, will quake and tremble at that houre, and would not be willing to come to judgement, if they could avoid it. Therefore it is not likely that they would ſpring forth, and put themſelves forward to meet the Lord.

The ſumme is, The godly which ſhall be then left, and be alive, ſhall be taken up into the aire. The Papiſts ſay, this is not to be done, [f] *without intercurrent*, or *intercedent death*: where-

[a] Nos viventes reliqui, ſimul cum illis rapiemur in nubibus in occurſum Domini in aera.
[b] Qui vivimus, qui relinquimur, &c.
[c] Sed ſuam perſonam verbi gratiâ profert.
[e] Apoſtolus Nos dixit, pro eo quod juſtos; de quorum & ego ſum numero.
[f] ſine media morte.

whereas the words are expresse, *We living, and remaining, shall be snatched up.* The argument of Gregorie de Valentia hath pith in it. For he saith, *If the live men do die,* [a] *it followeth that the just shall arise somewhat after others: for they shall both die and rise again.* Which opinion, because it is against all Divinitie, he mincieth and mollifieth thus, [1] *All may be said to arise together: so that may be said to be done at once, which is done in a very short time.* But this shift cannot serve his turn: for, ἐν ἀτόμῳ, ἐν πρώτῃ ἀσυλλήπτῳ (1. Corinth. 15. 52.) *in puncto*, or *in tempore indivisibili*, *in one instant*, is neither first nor last. But so shall all arise: and Bonaventure, *Sentent. 4. distinct. 43. quæst. 3.* proveth by six reasons, that [b] *There shall be a joynt resurrection of all together, and not successive*, as Valentia would have it. The frame may be this, from his confession; *The righteous shall not arise after others: But, by Valentia his acknowledgement, if the righteous, who shall be alive when Christ cometh, shall die, they must arise after others: Therefore they shall not die at all.* Though it be said, 1. Thess. 4. 16. *The dead in Christ shall arise first*, yet he saith not, he meaneth not, that they shall arise sooner then other men (much lesse later, as the Jesuit would fearly excuse it:) for all shall be raised together, good and bad, at the blowing of the trump: *All that are in the graves shall heare Christs voice* (one voice, one single voice shall be heard of all) *and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation*, John 5. 28, 29. They must not come forth one by one, or one after another; but all together. And not onely they who are dead, shall all arise together: but at the same time shall both the dead be raised, and the living changed: * *For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord* (perhaps, some of the words which he heard in the third heaven) *that we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.* And there is no likelihood that the dead shall prevent the living: Therefore all shall arise, or be changed together. *The Lord shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump*, 1. Thess. 4. 16. *With a great sound of a trumpet*, Matth. 24. 31. *The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed*, 1. Cor. 15. 52. All this shall be done at one time, the *change* of some, and the *resurrection* of others. No preeminence is in that point. Though the Apostle saith, *The dead in Christ shall arise first*; it is meant, before others shall meet Christ in the aire. [1] *For he setteth not down the order of their severall resurrections, but the order of their severall raptures and meetings with Christ*, saith the deep Aquinas. The raised and changed holy ones shall go together: the changed shall not meet Christ, till first the holy dead be raised.

Again,

[a] *Secundùm justos aliquando post resurrecturos, quidam alios: siquidem morientur, atque adeò resurgent.*

[1] *Omnes possunt dici resurgere simul, prout simul fieri dici potest quod sit sub idem tempus brevissimum.*

[b] *Resurrectio omnium sit simul, & non successivè.*

* 1. Thess. 4. 15.

[1] *Non enim ponit ordinem resurrectionis ad resurrectionem, sed ordinem ad raptum vel occurrentiam.*

Again, it is not, *Resurgent primi*, *Shall be the first who arise*, which is the bad translation of the Vulgat; but *dvaστησονται πρῶτον. Resurgent primùm*, *Shall arise first of all*, adverbially; *first*; that is, before others meet Christ. S. Augustine was sometimes doubtfull of the main point: but what saith he, *Tomo 4. de octo Dulcitii quæstionibus, quæst. 2.* upon these words, *WE WHO LIVE AND ARE LEFT? I would* (saith he) *heare more learned men concerning these words, and correct what I have sometimes thought otherwise, from hence; if they can be so expounded to me, as by them I may understand, that all who live now, or shall live, shall die.— But if in these words there can no other sense be found; and if it be cleare, that the Apostle would be understood, according to the evidence of the words, That there shall be some living in the end of the world, who shall not die corporally, but be clothed over with immortalitie, that mortalitie may be swallowed up of life; then to this opinion, without doubt, is agreeable that which in our Belief we confesse, That Christ shall come to judge both quick and dead.* So farre proceedeth that holy Father S. Augustine.

[1] *Qui non expoliantur corpore, sed superindumentur immortalitate, ne absorbatur mortale à vita.*

2. And because he hath named a second place, and insisteth in the Creed; it shall be my second argument; and thus do I shape it; The Creed Apostolicall saith, *Christ shall judge both the quick and the dead. He was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead*, saith S. Peter, Act. 10. 42. S. Paul hath the same, 2. Timoth. 4. 1. *Testificor coram Jesu Christo, qui judicaturus est vivos & mortuos*, *I testifie before Jesus Christ who shall judge the quick and the dead*, And when the Scriptures say so, *they*, [1] *understand it of the last generall judgement*, saith Bellarm. *de Purgat.* 2. 4. Yea the Apostle expresseth so much in the last cited verse of Timothie; *Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his Kingdome.* But his Kingdome was not of this world, and his first appearing was past; Therefore it must be at his second coming. The ground-work of the words being laid; thus the structure ariseth. By the word, *dead*, you cannot understand the parties as they are dead; for so Christ judgeth them not; alive people are the object of his judgement: But you must needs expound *dead* for those, that sometimes did die and now are raised to be judged, and are alive. The word *quick*, or *living*, you cannot interpret, as the Papists do, *such as are alive then, and shall die; and then be raised; and then be judged*: for it needed not to have been said, *He shall judge the quick and the dead*; but it had been sufficient to have said onely one of them, *He shall judge the quick*, or *the living*; for indeed they shall all be alive: or, *He shall judge the dead*; for even the living, and the quick shall die, as the Papists feigne. But indeed the Holy Writ divides all mankinde into two sorts: the one part shall be living, and not die, but be changed; the other are such, as sometimes died: *Viventes, & mortuos.* And thus there are no clouds in that article, *He shall judge the quick and the dead.*

[1] *De novissimo generali judicio.*

In the Creed there is neither redundancie, nor defect: in the Popish expositon there is redundancie: for, if all and every one shall die, it might as well have been expressed, *we shall judge the dead*: Or, if the dead, as dead, be not properly judged; it might onely have been said, *He shall judge the quick*: for, according to the Papists, all the living shall die, and be again made quick. But, as I said, the specializing of two sorts, *quick* and *dead*, evinceth, that some shall not die, and some have died.

These words of the Creed did much move Cajetan, as himself confesseth; and they are brought by S. Augustine to establish this point, That some shall not *die*, but shall be *changed*: though I confesse, the definitions *Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum*, cap. 8. leave it doubtfull. For thus they say, [a] *What we said in the Creed, That Christ at his coming shall judge the quick and the dead, we believe doth signifie, that not onely the just, but the sinners also shall be judged. And even those also who shall be found alive in their bodies of flesh, of whom our belief is, that they shall yet die, or, as others think, be changed: that being raised immediately, or changed, they may be judged with those who died before*: And yet, me thinks, another exposition of Ruffinus is as bad: for *quick and dead* he understandeth of *souls and bodies*; As if the souls were not sentenced before, in the particular judgement; as if the bodies were then dead, or to be dead, when they are judged.

3. I have not yet ended with the words of the great S. Augustine: but from the phrases used by him, out of the Holy Writ, of *Expoliari*, & *Superindui*, *To be unclothed*, and *clothed upon*, I thus frame another argument.

S. Paul saith, 2. Corinthy. 5. [illegible] *we would not be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortalitie might be swallowed up of life.* He, who is not *unclothed*, but *clothed upon*, holdeth what he had, layeth down nothing, and hath somewhat added to him. But by this garment, Metaphorically, is the bodie meant, which shall not be cast off from the soul, or the soul from it; but in the change shall be arayed with immortalitie.

Now if there be not an expoliation, if there be not a separation of the soul from the bodie; there is no death: But there is no such expoliation: therefore they who have other clothing put upon them, shall not die. Cajetan, upon the words *SUPERINDUI CUPIENTES, DESIRING TO BE CLOTHED UPON &c.* saith, *The same shall truly befall us*, [b] *if at Christs coming we shall be found clothed with our bodies, and not naked: that is, if we shall then remain alive, and not be dead before.* And the same Cajetan confuteth Aquinas his exposition, on the place. Doctour Estius approveth Cajetan; and so doth Cornelius Cornelii à Lapide, on the words.

Lorinus on Act. 10. and Justinian upon these passages of S. Paul,

[a] *Quod dicimus in symbolo, in adventu Domini vivos & mortuos judicandos, non solùm justos & peccatores significari credimus, sed & vivos eos, qui in carne inveniendi sunt: qui adhuc morituri creduntur, vel immutandi sunt, ut alii volunt; ut suscitati continuò, vel reformati, cum antè mortuis judicentur.*

[b] *Si in die Domini, vestiti corpore, & non nudi, inventi fuerimus; id est, si tunc residui futuri sumus, & nondum mortui.*

Paul, will by no means cenſure our opinion, as Catharinus and Soto do: and this they profeſſe, though they be Jeſuits. For indeed our opinion is confirmed by S. Auguſtine, *de peccatorum meritis & remiſ. l. 2.* *If Adam had not ſinned, his ſoul had never been diſunited from his bodie, but he had been clothed upon with immortalitie, and incorruption: ſo that the mortall part ſhould have been ſwallowed up of life, that is, ſhould be changed from a carnall life into a ſpirituall.* Otherwhere S. Auguſtine ſaith, *Adam had a ſtate, by which he might paſſe from mortalitie to immortalitie without taſting or partaking of death.* Bellarmine ſpeaking of Adam, citeth this, and likeith it. Why therefore may not they, that ſhall be *reſidui*, *left*, be alſo without death tranſlated into glorie? If the Jeſuits had had ſuch an argument, they would have ſaid, It were convenient for God ſo to do it, yea neceſſarie; that by plain demonſtration mankinde might ſee and know, what eſtate they had, and what eſtate ſometimes they loſt in Adam, and that all mankinde ſhould have been ſo tranſlated, if ſinne had not hindered, and thruſt death among us. I will onely ſay, It may be, that ſome are therefore kept to be tranſlated, to ſhew the manner how Adam without death ſhould have been changed.

Salmeron objecteth, *Children found alive at that time, if they die not, ſhall continue in the ſame ſtature: which may not be believed.* I anſwer, he derogateth from the power of God, as if he were not able to make *children* to be *men* by the *change*, as he is able by *death*. Can God make *children* of *ſtones*? and can he not make *men* of *children*? Did he create Adam to be a full grown man, of earth? and will his hand be ſhortned in the immutation? God, out of the little duſt of little children, raiſeth up, by Salmerons confeſſion, infinite, perfect bodies of men: therefore the ſame God may as well, as eaſily, and perhaps more eaſily, (if God doth ſuch things more eaſily, then other) of the ſame living bodies of little children, by that myſterious change, produce and ampliate every member to the full growth of perfect men. God cauſed the rod of Aaron to bud, *and it brought forth buds, and bloſſoms, and yielded almonds*, Numb 17. 8. and yet it was ſevered from the root, and laid up in the Tabernacle of the Congregation, before the teſtimonie, free from water, or earth, to nourith it: and this was done the morrow after it was there laid: though it would not have born almonds, if it had been ſtill united to the ſtock; perhaps, for many yeares after. Did the ſame God reſtore unto Jeroboam, his hand which was dried up before, *ſo that he could not pull it back to him again*, 1 Kings, 13. 4. and that on a ſudden, at the prayer of the Prophet? And will Salmeron think, that if children do not die, they ſhall continue ſtill children, although they be changed? Who knoweth not, that the *change* is as great a part of Gods power, as the *reſurrection*?

« *Si non peccâſſet Adam, non erat expoliandus corpore, ſed ſuperveſtiendus immortalitate & incorruptione, ut abſorberetur mortale à vitâ: id eſt, ab animali in ſpirituale tranſiret.*

Salmeron again objecteth, *if the living or quick at that day, shall not die, The wicked ones* [a] *shall avoid the fire of conflagration.* I answer first, That the fire of conflagration shall be after judgement. Secondly, if they should escape that fire, they cannot flee from the fire of hell. Thirdly, the wicked ones shall arise with the just, all together. The wicked ones may be changed also at the same instant, that the just are, and that is, at the same instant of the resurrection. *Christ is the resurrection, and the life*, John 11. 25. The *resurrection* to them that are *dead*, perhaps the *life* to them that are *changed*, and *die not*. The resurrection of the *dead Saints*, is called *the resurrection unto life*. The resurrection of the *dead wicked ones*, is called *the resurrection unto damnation*, John 5. 28. Likewise, say I, The *change of the wicked*, (if changed they be, as I hold it most likely) may be called *the change unto shame and pain eternall*; as the *change of the godly*, may be called *a change unto glorie*. For the wicked shall reap no benefit by that change: nor shall they meet Christ in the aire, by any extraordinarie rapture, as I conceive. And since they die the second death; it mattereth not, if they avoid, either the first death, by immutation; or the fire of conflagration. Lastly, if they shall meet Christ in the aire, it is to their greater terrour: They shall be hurried to their judge, and haled toward their punishment: they meet him not, as he is *a milde Saviour*; but as *an angrie and just God*. And this is a sufficient answer both to the second and third objection of Salmeron; as the learned, who reade him, can testifie.

4. Another argument, and that of moment and validitie, to prove that some shall hereafter be excepted from death, is taken from that memorable, diversly read, diversly expounded place of the Apostle, 1. Corinth. 15. 51. πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, [c] *We shall not all die, but we shall all be changed*; as the Interlinearie hath it. And this is the first, and best reading. Let us examine, first the words, and the severall translations; and so approach to the exposition.

The Greek cited by me at large, is in all the Greek copies: so saith Peter Martyr; and Doctour Estius confirmeth the same: so likewise doth Chrysostom, and Theophylact reade it: and Theodoret, and Justinus *ad Orthodoxos, quæst. 61. & quæst. 109.* and Origen, *in tertio volumine enarrationis Epistolæ primæ ad Thessalonicenses*, as also in his book against Marcion, *Which is a manuscript in the Vatican*, saith Estius. So Oecumenius, *Prognost. 348. So Theodoret, Heraclentes readeth it*, saith S. Hierom, *in Tom. 3. Epistolarum*, pag. 198. and in the end of the same Epistle to Minervius and Alexander, S. Hierom acknowledgeth, that even in his dayes the Greeks did not reade it as the Latinists. Salmeron on the place, findes fault with, πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, *Omnes quidem non dormiemus, All of us shall not die*: which according to

[a] *Ignem conflagrationis evadent.*

[c] *Omnes autem non dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur.*

[f] *Quod, juxta verborum proprietatem, perinde est ac dicere, Nullos dormituros: non enim dicitur*, Non omnes dormiemus, *quid declararet, aliquos non morituros. Est grande discrimen apud Logicos inter* Non omnes dormiemus, *&*, Omnes non dormiemus.

to the proprietie of the words, is as if he had said, NONE SHALL DIE. For it is not said, NOT ALL OF US SHALL DIE, by which words it meant and declared, that some shall not die. And there is a great difference among Logicians between these two propositions, NOT ALL OF US SHALL DIE, and, ALL OF US SHALL NOT DIE. So farre he.

First, I say, Estius a learned Doctour, and Popish Divine, doth sleight this subtiltie: [a] *Know* (saith he) *that the sense is no whit changed or altered, whether you reade it thus, ALL OF US SHALL NOT DIE, as the order of the words is in the Greek text: or thus, NOT ALL OF US SHALL DIE, as Hierom readeth it, and most of the Latines interpret it.*

Secondly, I say, if we should maintain that none shall die of them that are *reliqui, then remaining alive*; but that both good and bad, shall all be changed without death; I see no inconvenience to arise from that opinion.

Catharinus, in his Commentaries, findes fault with those, who follow the first reading, [illegible]: but Estius findes fault with him for his fault finding; condemning him of inconsideration, and rashnes. The Arabick accordeth with the Greek; *Non omnes non moriemur, sed non omnes immutabimur, We all shall not die, but we all shall be changed.* The Syriack also is in harmonie with both Greek and Arabick (though Salmeronis nicetie may think it a jarre) *Non omnes nos obdormiemus, omnes autem nos immutabimur; Not all we shall sleep, but all we shall be changed;* yea, *an old vulgar translation, which is in Basil in the library of the Predicants* (saith Erasmus) *agreeth with our Greek.* Aquinas himself, in the end of his 81. Lect. confesseth, that our Greek reading is in sense consonant to that which the Apostle wrote to the Thessalonians, the first Epist. 4. chap. and 17. verse. Scriptures sweetly expound Scripture: *We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,* saith the Apostle here: and to the Thessalonians, *We which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together.* The very Prefaces have a correspondence in substance, and are more then ordinarie; *This we say unto you by the word of the Lord,* 1. Thessal. 4. 15. and here, 1. Corinth. 15. 51. *Behold, I shew you a mysterie:* And then doth he, in both places evince an immutation, without death. Therefore there can be no danger in our opinion, as may be evinced from Aquinas his free acknowledgement. Yea, there is not onely no danger, but great reason for it: for, How excellently doth this agree with that, which presently followeth, verse 52. *The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.* Doth he not plainly discriminate and divers those, which shall be *raised* from those which shall be *changed?* He doth not say, *We shall be raised incorruptible, and, We shall be changed;* as he must have done, if all are to die, and then to be changed. And, to shew that the change is not by laying down

[a] *Scito sensum non mutari, sive legas,* Omnes quidem non dormiemus, *qui ordo verborum est in Graco: sive,* Non omnes quidem dormiemus, *quomodo legit Hieronymus, & plerique Latini veterum.*

of the bodie, he addeth immediately, *This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortall must put on immortalitie*, vers. 53. phrases implying no *losse*, no *decay*, no *separation*; but a *superinduction*, and *superaddition* to what before was enjoyed. And when this is done, he saith most pertinently, vers. 54. *Then shall be brought to passe the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victorie*: as if he had said, *When both these things are accomplished, the raising of the dead, and the change of the living, so that they shall be no more mortall; then shall death be overcome: O DEATH, WHERE IS THY STING?* vers. 55.

So much for the first and best reading, πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα. I come to the second (which is varied by the addition of one letter; but it makes a contrarietie in the sense) πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα. *Omnes non dormiemus, All of us shall not sleep*, saith the former: *Omnes dormiemus, All of us shall sleep*, saith the latter. And this latter way it seemeth to have been read in some few copies, even in S. Hieroms time. But *this Greek lection is justly suspected* (saith the worthy Estius;) *the Greek being so easily turned into it, by the addition of ν, or a little dash.* And he findeth just fault with Acacius in Hierom, for saying it was so read in most Greek copies; when as, certainly it was read so but in verie few copies; whereof there is scarce one now extant, and not many proofs that ever there were many copies of that extant. Neither indeed doth the reading stand with sense. For the Apostle solemnly premizeth, *Behold, I shew you a mysterie*: and then subjoyneth immediately, according to this new-fangled miss-writing, *We shall all therefore sleep, or die.* Is this a mysterie, that all shall sleep, or all die? Doth he promise *mountains*, and bring forth a *molehill*? Every Heathen knows, that we shall die; every Christian, Turk, and Jew, that we shall be raised again. But, when God justly for sinne sentenced man to death with a *morte morieris*, That some sinfull men should be excepted, is a mysterie, deserving such a watchword, as *Behold: Behold, I shew you a mysterie; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.*

Secondly, from the word κοιμηθησόμεθα, I thus argue: That death (if such a death there be any) which is so speedily begun, by separation of the soul from the bodie, and ended (as I may so say) by the swift and momentanie reuniting of the same soul to the same bodie, cannot handsomely be called a *sleep*. Doth he sleep, who in the twinkling of an eye is changed from mortalitie to immortalitie? yea, from being alive, is made dead? and from being dead, is made alive; and that incorruptibly? Was ever sleep confined to an instant, till now? or may one be said to sleep, in the midst of these great works? It is not so much as Analogicall sleep. The greatest sleepers have more then an instant, ere they can begin to sleep. Sleep creep-

creepeth or falleth on men by degrees, heavinesse and dulnesse ouer it, and the spirits haue a time to retire to their forts, and citadels, the senses are not locked up, nor do they depositе the use of their faculties in a moment. And may that be called properly *rest*, or *sleep*, which resteth not aboue an instant, and is as quick as thought? Rest and sleep do couch upon the bed of time: likewise it is as much as possibly can be done, (if so much can be done) to awake one in an instant. The Scripture useth the phrase of *sleeping* towards them, who rest (as it were) in death, in the earth, in the grave: *Our friend Lazarus sleepeth*, saith Christ, Joan 11.11. when indeed he was buried. *Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake*, Dan. 12.2. Let one place of holy Writ be produced, where one and the same instant begunneth sleep, and endeth awaking, and then I may say, there may be some shadow for that reading. But here is no pause, no rest, no quiet; therefore no sleep: therefore the word *sleep* in this place, is applied to such as died before, and not to such as are alive, and shall die, as the second lection implieth.

Thirdly, it wanteth force, to say in the whole conjoyned sentence, *We shall therefore all sleep, or die; but we shall all be changed.* If the Apostle had intended any such thing, he would not have used the adversative particle *but*; but the implicative word *And*: *We shall all therefore sleep; AND we shall all be changed.* This had been sense, if thus it had been: but not being so, we may the more confidently shake off the second lection, of *non omnes*, as abhorrent from reason; and cleave to the first, of πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα. *Omnes quidem non dormiemus, &c. All we shall not die, but all we shall be changed.*

And so, from the varietie of Greek copies, I come to the Vulgat, the Translation in Latine, *Omnes quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur; Truely we shall all of us arise; but we shall not all of us be changed.*

First, I say, this differeth from all Greek copies, whereas, if it had been according to any sort of them, it might have swayed us much that way.

Secondly, the same argument touched before, may also give a side-blow to this translation. The Apostle raiseth up their considerations, by promising to tell them a mysterie. But it was no mysterie to tell them, that they should all be raised, when he had told it so pithily, so divinely, and so often beat upon it before, by so many kindes of arguments, as he did.

Thirdly, where the Vulgat saith, *Non omnes immutabimur*, it is not true: for *Omnes immutabimur, We shall all be changed*, from *mortalitie* to *immortalitie*, from *naturall bodies* to *spirituall*. If you say, We shall not be all changed to glorie; I say to with

with you: I adde, That is no myſteries, all know that. Therefore the Apoſtle ſpeaketh not of a change to glorie eternall in the heavens; whereunto ſome onely ſhall be changed; but he ſpeaketh of a change from *mortalitie* to *immortalitie*, from *corruptible bodies* to *incorruptible*; which even the wickedeſt men ſhall have. And perhaps he meaneth, that this generall immutation ſhall be made, *ſine media morte*, *without intercurrent*, or *intercedent death*, even in the wicked that ſhall be then alive; yet in the change, you muſt alwaies make this diverſitie: The wicked ſhall be ſingled out to ſhame, to loſſe, to puniſhment eternall, with their raiſed or changed bodies (for even in their raiſing alſo, there is a change from corruption to incorruption:) but in the change of the godly, there is glorious incorruption, joyfull immortalitie, pleaſurable eternitie.

The word ἀλλαγησόμεθα ſignifieth a change of a thing from place to place; as when we take a piece of wood from the earth, and caſt it into the water: Thus the wicked ſhall be hurried from their graves to the judgement ſeat; and ſhall be placed on the left hand of our Saviour; and, after ſentence, ſhall be haled, and caſt from earth into hell. On the other ſide, the righteous in their change ſhall be mounted up from their graves, or from the earth, into the aire, to meet Chriſt; and ſhall be at his right hand; and, after ſentence, be carried or aſcend up into heaven, in moſt glorious manner, to live with Chriſt eternally.

Fourthly, if we reade it with the Vulgat, *We ſhall all ariſe, but we ſhall not all be changed*, we muſt alſo immediately annex the words, *In a moment, in the twinkling of an eie, at the laſt trump:* for there is the pauſe, and ſtay to be made; there is the full ſentence. The Vulgat hath done very ill, to make the ſtay and full point at *immutabimur*: for then the words following bear no conſtruction at all, if they be conſidered by themſelves; *In a moment, in the twinkling of an eie, at the laſt trump.* For then cometh in new matter; *For the trumpet ſhall ſound, and the dead ſhall be raiſed incorruptible, and we ſhall be changed: For this corruptible muſt put on incorruption, &c.* What coherence ſubſequent then ſhall you make unto theſe words? None at all. The coherence muſt be with the antecedent words. But, ſay I, take the antecedent words, as the Vulgat hath them; and reade, as you muſt, the connexion in this ſort, *We ſhall indeed all ariſe: but ſhall not all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the laſt trump: For the trumpet ſhall ſound, &c.* I ſay, even in this reading there is little ſenſe alſo; yea, much untruth. Is it not certain that we ſhall be changed in a moment? Or how long ſhall the time of change be? There is no way to avoid this foul abſurditie, which cometh by the Vulgat edition; unleſſe it be by a greater, that

is,

is, by saying that you will make an Hyperbaton, and include those words, *We shall not all be changed*, in a Parenthesis: and then the sense will be, *We shall arise in a moment, &c.* For, though it be true, that we shall arise in a moment, yet there is no ground, that we shall not be changed in a moment. In all likelihood, a change may rather be more speedie, which is without death, then that change which is made through death and resurrection. If they may be, and shall be raised and changed in a moment; they may in a moment be changed, and not raised.

Secondly, no authoritie, that I know, runneth for such a needlesse Parenthesis: and I deem it as a violence offered to the Text, so to strain it, when the sense will runne fairly otherwise, according to the best Greek copies, *We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump.*

Then this also serve to have been spoken against the Latin Vulgat edition, and its bad reading, *Omnes quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur. In momento, in ictu oculi, in novissima tuba, canet enim tuba, & mortui resurgent incorrupti, &c.* By how much the lesse sense is in this, by so much the more are we bound to adhere to the Originall, and the most common and best copies of it.

This I may be bold to averre, That if some shall not die, and yet be changed, there shall be no infallible, yea demonstrative proof unto sense, That the very self same bodie which man had, shall inherit eternall glorie. For, if they die not, they must needs keep and have the same bodies, from which they are not parted by immutation. Yea the identicall resurrection of the same very bodies which were dead, may thus farre be proved, That if the *changed bodies* shall be still the same in *substance*, though differing in *qualities*, the *raised bodies* also shall be no otherwise, nor any way different: and Pythagoras will then disprove his * *transmigration of soule into diverse bodies*, and his heathenish † *regeneration* (to which Nicodemus seemed to have an eye, Joh. 3. 4.) when every soul cometh arayed with its own bodie, and when they, who by change put not off their bodies, shall come alive to judgement.

5. The Pelagians were wont thus to argue, If sinne came in by Adam, then all must needs die: But some shall not die, namely those, *who shall be found remaining alive*. Therefore sinne came not into the world by Adam. S. Augustine answereth this argument very sufficiently otherwise: and it may easily and briefly be answered, All shall die *once*, though not *now*. Yet that holy Father, and that great just enemie of the accursed Pelagians, * *sin the greater and better sinnarie and sofarie*, would seem to rest doubtfull of their assumption; which he

* Metempsychosin.
† Palingenesiam.

ɣ Qui reperiuntur vivi

* In majorem spiritualem.

he needed not. Whereupon, *de Civitat.* 20. 20. he ſaith, [a] *Death goeth before, a moſt ſhort and ſpeedie one, yet a death.* And in the ſame place, [b] *They ſhall ſlip, ſaid, or paſſe over by death to immortalitie with wonderfull ſpeed.* Again, *de peccat. merit. & remiſſ.* 2. 31. [c] *God at the end of the world ſhall grant this priviledge unto ſome, That by reaſon of their ſudden change they ſhall not feel death.* And, *Retract.* 2. 33. [d] *Either they die not, or otherwiſe they glide from this life into death, and from death into eternall life, as it were, in the twinkling of an eye, by a moſt ſpeedie alteration, taking no notice or ſenſe of death.* He leaves it doubtfull (as you ſee) in theſe his laſt books: though ſometimes before he thought, That all ſhould die; and otherwhere, as *ad Dulcitium, quæſt.* 3. That they ſhould not die.

The Maſter of the Sentences ſaith concerning the queſtion, Whether the change be by death, or without it, [e] *Man cannot determine certainly which of theſe is trueſt.* Rabanus, *lib.* 4. *de ſermon. proprietat.* having alledged the conſent of divers Fathers to eſtabliſh his own opinion, *That all muſt die*, yet annexeth this, *Becauſe there are others alike Catholick and learned men, who beleeve, That, the ſoul remaining in the bodie, theſe ſhall be changed to immortalitie, who ſhall be found alive at the coming of our Lord*; [f] *and that it ſtands them in ſtead of riſing from the dead, that they caſt away mortalitie by change, not by death; Let any man reſt on which opinion he pleaſeth, &c.* Which very words alſo, you ſhall finde in the book *de Eccleſiaſt. Dogmat. cap.* 17. Now though S. Auguſtine was dubious, and ſome with him; and though ſome alſo have imbraced the contrary opinion: yet equally Catholick and learned men have been conſtant to maintain, That ſome ſhall not *die*, but be *changed*; as you have heard confeſſed.

If you pleaſe, you may take a view of ſome, more particularly. The afore named Theodorus Heracleotes, cited by Hierom, in his epiſtle to Minerius and Alexander, hath it thus; [i] *The Saints, who in the day of the laſt judgement ſhall be found to be alive and remain in their earthly bodies, ſhall not ſee death, or taſte of it; and ſhall be with the Lord, kicking and ſpurning at death and the greateſt inforcing neceſſitie thereof.* Apollinaris, cited in the ſame epiſtle, ſaid, *Some ſhall not die; but be ſnatcht out of this life, that with changed, and glorified bodies, they might be with Chriſt.* Chryſoſtom on the 10. to the Romanes, and on 1. Theſſ. 4. and upon this place to the Corinthians, ſaith, *Some ſhall eſcape death.* With him agreeth Epiphanius, *Hæreſ* 64. ſaying, [k] *Who is ſuddenly ſnatched up, is not yet dead.* And before them, Origen, *lib.* 2. *contra Celſum*, ſo opineth. Theophylact on 1. Corinth. 15. thus, [l] *Even they who ſhall not die, ſhall be tranſchanged out of this corruptible life, to incorruptibilitie.* And again, [m] *Some indeed ſhall not die at all.* To that effect S. Hierom in his epiſtle to Marcella, *quæſt.* 3. *num.*

[a] *Dormitio præcedit, quamvis breviſſima, non tamen nulla.*

[b] *Per mortem ad immortalitatem mira celeritate tranſibunt.*

[c] *Hoc quibuſdam ita fine largitur Deus, ut mortem iſtam repentinâ commutatione non ſentiant.*

[d] *Aut non morientur, aut de vita iſta in mortem, & de morte in æternam vitam, celerrimâ commutatione, tanquam in ictu oculi tranſeundo, mortem non ſentient.*

[e] *Horum quid ſit verius, non eſt humani judicii definire.*

[f] *Et hoc eis reputari pro reſurrectione ex mortuis, quòd mortalitatem immutatione deponant, non morte, &c.*

[i] *Sancti, qui in die judicii in corporibus reperiendi ſunt, non guſtabunt mortem; erunt que cum Domino, graviſſimâ mortis neceſſitate calcatâ.*

[k] *Qui rapitur, nondum mortuus eſt.*

[l] *Etiam qui non morietur, ad incorruptibilitatem transferetur.*

[m] *Nonnulli vè morientur quidem.*

num. 148. and in his epistle to Minerius and Alexander, bringeth the saying of Christ (Matth. 24. 37. &c.) of the dayes of Noah, when the floud swept them away, as they were eating and drinking; to prove that at the last judgement some shall not die. Theodoret urgeth the same truth, producing the passage of Matth. 24. 40. of two in the field; one assumed, the other rejected. And Chrysostom, in his Sermon *de Ascensione Domini*, instanceth in the verse following, of two in a mill, one refused, the other accepted: which proofs aim at this, That all shall not die. Cajetan is rich in proofs, That all shall not die. See him on Act. 10. upon 1. Timoth. 4. upon 1. Corinth. 15. upon 1. Thessal. 4. Tertullians words must not be omitted, in his book *de resurrectione carnis*; [a] *This gracious privileage belongs unto those, who at the coming of our Lord and Saviour to judgement shall be found alive upon earth: and for the grievous afflictions and pressures of the times under Antichrist they shall have granted unto them this indulgence, That they shall not die, but shall be suddenly changed, and so go to meet Christ together with those which shall then be raised from the dead.*

[a] *Hujus gratiæ privilegium illos manet, qui ab adventu Domini, deprehendentur in carne: & propter duritiæ temporum Antichristi, merebuntur, compendio mortis per demutationem expuncta, concurrere cum resurgentibus.*

Salmeron being peremptorie, That all and every one shall die properly, upon 1. Thessal. 4. hath a wilde crotchet, That all, who shall be alive toward the end of the world, shall be consumed with the fire of conflagration, which shall go before Christ; and so dead and raised shall be snatched up. But S. Augustine, *de Civitat. Dei*, 20. 16. setting down the order of the last judgement, saith, *The fire of conflagration shall be after the last judgement.*

I will close this point, with the sound and learned words of Calvin, (which fully accord, with what I rested on, in the beginning of this chapter) upon 1. Corinth. 15. [o] *Since there cannot be a change* (saith he,) *but the former nature must be abolished; the very change, on good grounds, may justly be accounted a kinde of death: but since there is not a separation of the soul from the bodie, it is not to be reputed as if it were the common and ordinarie death.* Upon 1. Thessal. 4. he wittily observeth, that they [p] *who are dead, or do die, for some space of time or other (longer or shorter) their souls put off the substantiall clothing of the bodie or flesh: but they who shall be changed, shall put off onely the qualitie, not the substance.*

[o] *Cùm mutatio fieri nequeat, quin aboleatur prior natura, ipsa mutatio meritò censetur species mortis: sed cùm non fit anima à corpore solutio, non reputatur in morte ordinaria.*

[p] *Qui dormiunt, aliquo temporis spatio exuunt corporis substantiam; qui immutabuntur, non nisi qualitatem.*

The summe of all is this, The third main question, by me at first propounded, was, Whether all and every one, without exception, must and shall die? The Papists are obstinate for the affirmative; I have proved the negative, That some may be, some have been, and some others shall be excepted, and not die. And so I end my third and last Chapter of my third book of Miscellanies.

O Moſt gracious Lord God, who haſt committed all judgement to thy onely ſonne, our onely Lord and Saviour, I beſeech thee to have pitie upon me, and for Jeſus Chriſt his ſake, receive me into thy eſpeciall favour. O bleſſed Jesu, accept of theſe my poore and weak endeavours, and receive my prayers, and preſent them with mercie to the throne of Grace: haſten thy coming, and thy kingdome: Come ſweet Jesu, come quickly: and prepare my ſoul, to meet thee with joy. If it be thy holy will, let me be one of them, that ſhall be changed, and changed to the better: from *pain* to *comfort*, from *ſickneſſe*, *ſorrow*, and *labour*, to *reſt*, and *bleſſedneſſe eternall*. Amen. Amen. Amen.

UNI-TRINO DEO LAUS, ET GLORIA.

FINIS.

An Alphabeticall Table of the principall things contained in these three Books of Miscellanies.

A

Abortion is a curse. Book 1. pag. 103. *Two kindes of Abortives.* ibid. pag. 98, 99.

Adams body was created immortall, and how. ibid. p. 11. *Adams body was framed of other dust, then the dust of Paradise.* ibid. p. 16. viz. *out of the red earth of* ager Damascenus. ibid. p. 85. & Book 2. p. 23. *The contrarie disposition of Elements had not caused a dissolution of Adams body, had Adam stood.* Book 1. p. 17, to 28. *The naturall temper and constitution of Adams body in state of innocencie.* ibid. p. 18, and 20. *Whether if Adam and Eve had stood confirmed in innocencie, any of their children could have sinned.* ibid. p. 44, to 54. *The endowments of Adam in state of innocencie,* ib. p. 55, 56. *Whether Adam and Eve foreknew their fall.* ibid. p. 59. *Whether Adam and Eves sinne were the same.* ibid. p. 61. *Whether of their sinnes were the greater.* ibid. p. 62, 65, to 73. *where also of Adams first sinne by which he fell.* ibid. *Adam mourned 100 yeares for the murdered Abel.* ibid. p. 85, 87. *Adam was a type of Christ; therefore saved.* ibid. *Adam was buried in Golgotha, and his skull found upon mount Calvary.* Book 2. from p. 13, to 29. *Whether Adam could naturally understand all languages.* ibid. p. 47, 48.

Amphibologie prejudiciall to truth. Book 1. p. 2.

Angels fell the second instans of their creation. ib. p. 108, and 126. *Christ merited for Angels.* ib. p. 189, 190. *Angels representing men are called men in the Scripture.* Book 2. *chap.* 16.

Apocryphall books too much slighted. Book 2. p. 145. *They are to be preferred before any other humane Authours.* Book 3. p. 183.

Of the diverse Appointment of things by God. Book 1. p. 2, 3.

The Apostles represented the whole body of Christs Ministers. ibid. p. 147, 148. *The Apostles were none of them learned before their calling.* Book 2. p. 87, 88.

Aristotle and Plato compared. Book 1. p. 13, 14, 15.

The Ascension of Christ represented in the assumption of Enoch and Elias. Book 3. p. 191, to 195.

B

Beauty desired. Book 1. pag. 19.

The Being, or not Being of a thing may be said divers wayes. Book 2. p. 77.

Bristoll built of old by Brennus. ibid. p. 23, 24.

C

Whence the Capitol in Rome had its name. B. 2. pag. 18.

Ceremonies Levitical died at first by degrees; and now they are not onely dead, but deadly. Book 1. p. 3.

There is no Chance where Providence reigneth. Book 2. p. 71, 72.

The Table.

Cherubims with reall flaming ſwords were placed in Paradiſe. Book 1. p. 23. *and why.* ibid. p. 23.

Chriſts beauty in his humanitie deſcribed, together with his Paſſion. B. 1. p. 18, 19, 20. *compare* ibid. p. 193. *Chriſt doth us more good then Adam did us harm.* ibid. p. 185, to 188. *Chriſt ſaved more in number then Adam condemned.* ibid. p. 188, 189. &c. *Whether Chriſt were in Adam; and how.* ibid. p. 82, 83.

The judgement of the eſſentiall Church of Chriſt is infallible. ibid. p. 148.

Circumciſion of women by the Turks. ibid. p. 144.

A wicked Companion is very dangerous. Book 3. p. 184, 185.

Conception what it is, and how. B. 1. p. 93, to 99.

Confirmation in grace is of two ſorts. ibid. p. 48.

Generall Councels are the higheſt earthly Judges of Scriptures controverſed. ibid. p. 136, 148.

D

Death is threefold. Book 1. p. 4. *Death is common to all.* ibid. *Death Naturall, and Violent.* ibid. p. 17. *Sinne is the onely cauſe of Death.* ibid. p. 26, 27. *Death is bitter, becauſe painfull.* ibid. pag. 28, 31. *Death is ſweet to ſome men, becauſe God makes it beneficiall unto them.* ibid. pag. 32, 33, &c. *Death was inflicted on Adam for one ſinne.* ibid. *Death was inflicted for the ſinne of the man Adam, not of the woman Eve.* ibid. pag. 36, to 44. *Speedy death by ſome is accounted beſt.* Book 3. pag. 187. *Whether all Adams poſteritie, without privilege or exception, muſt, and ſhall die.* Book 3. *Chap.* 1, 2, 3, *throughout.*

The difference between Διάνοια *and* Διάνοιαι. Book 1. pag. 192, 193. &c.

Diſciples of Chriſt were none of them Noble, at leaſt not Nobly bred. Book 2. pag. 86.

E

Of the Eaſt-Indians and their language. Book 3. p. 204.

Of Elias and Enoch, whether they be yet living or dead. Book 3. *Chap.* 2. *throughout. Divers queſtions about Enoch more eſpecially.* ibid. p. 181, 182, &c.

Equivocation in what ſenſe, and in what caſes it may be allowable. Book 1. pag. 165, 167.

The ſecond book of Eſdras was never held Canonicall. ibid. p. 7.

Eve remained an intemerate virgin untill after the ſinne of Adam. ib. p. 39, 40. *Whether Eve ſinned before ſhe talked with the ſerpent,* ibid. pag. 60.

Excommunication was of three ſorts in the Jewiſh politie. Book 2. pag. 48, 49.

F

The word Father *is diverſly taken in the holy Scripture.* Book 1. pag. 120. *and* Book 2. pag. 113, &c.

G

Genealogies were ever drawn from the Males. Book 1. page 40, 41.

H

The Healed by Chriſt were never a ſecond time cured of any diſeaſe. Book 2. p. 8.

Heavenly influences, which are noxious, are the cauſes of much ſickneſſe and deſtruction. Book 1. p. 17.

All

All languages have some words retaining the foot-steps of the Hebrew. Book 2. p. 45. *When the Hebrew points were first used.* Book 1. p. 100, 101, 102.
Hebron the citie. Book 2. page 19, to 29.
Humilitie. B. 1. p. 161, 162. *The humilitie of S. Paul.* Book 2. p. 84, 85.
The Husband represents the wife. Book 1. p. 140.

I

JEr. 10. 11. *was the onely verse of his whole prophesie, that was written in Chaldee; which every captive Jew was commanded to cast in the teeth of the Babylonians.* Book 1. p. 180.
Jerusalem the holy citie. Book 2. p. 154, 155, 156.
Ignorance threefold. Book 1. p. 60.
Interpretation of Scriptures is the Pastours right, with whom the Laitie must consult. ibid. p. 149, 150, 156, 181, 182. & Book 2. p. 63. *Interpretation of Scriptures by Anagrams is prophane.* B. 1. p. 152, 153. *Whether interpretation of Scriptures, or judgement of doctrine do in any sort belong unto the people; and how farre.* ibid. p. 157, 159. *Helps and cautions prescribed unto the people for interpretation of Scriptures.* ibid. *pag.* 160, *to pag.* 169, &c.
John the Apostle his death. Book 3. p. 187, 188, 189.
Joseph was the first-born of Jacob. Book 1. p. 142, 143. *Joseph was a type of Christ.* Book 2. p. 33.
A twofold acception of the word Judgement. Book 1. p. 6. *Judgement after death is private, of soules; publick, of bodies and soules.* ibid.

K.

KIngs represent the people under them. Book 1. p. 183, 184. *Of the honour due unto the King.* ibid.
Whether Korah, Dathan and Abiram descended with all their goods truly into hell. Book 3. p. 214, 215, *to* p. 221.

L

WHerein the confusion of Languages consisted. Book 2. p. 45, 46. *Oriental languages conduce much to the understanding of Scriptures; therefore necessarie to be studied.* ib. p. 48. *Of the same languages also.* B. 3. p. 204, 205.
Of Lazarus raised by Christ. Book 2. p. 7, 8, 9.
Humane Learning is an handmaid to Divinitie. ib. p. 88, 89.
Literall sense of Scripture is hardest to be found. Book 1. p. 149.

M

MAgistrates not to be reviled. Book 1. p. 168, 169, 170.
Maran-atha expounded. Book 2. p. 48, *to* p. 54.
Of Melchisedech, and why he is said to be without father and mother. Book 3. p. 201, 202, &c. *to* p. 206.
Members of the bodie are not all of equall worth. Book 1. p. 63.
God is very Mercifull unto all. ib. p. 186, 187.
Whether Moses at the Transfiguration appeared in his own true person, or not. Book 3. p. 208, 209, &c.

O

IN Oaths we must be warie of mentall reservations, and unlawfull equivocations. Book 1. p. 166, 167.
Opinion. Book 2. p. 83.
Originall sinne. See Sinne.

P

OF Paradise. Book 3. pag. 194, 195, 196, 197.

The Paſtours wiſdome, both for the matter and manner of his doctrine. Book 1. p. 158.

The Patriarchs were buried in Sychem. Book 2. chap. 10.

Meerly Perſonalls are not propagated. B. 1. p. 109, *to* p. 138.

S. Peter repreſented all the Apoſtles; Joh. 21. 15, 16. Book 1. p. 147.

The Pope is ſervus ſervorum Dei. ibid. p. 132.

The Priviledges of a few make not a law. Book 2. p. 160.

Whether God may juſtly Puniſh the Fathers for the childrens allwall delinquencies. B. 1. p. 119, 120. *In what caſes God may, and doth puniſh the children for their Parents faults, either with temporall, or eternall puniſhment.* ib. p. 118, *to* p. 124. *Every individuall man is juſtly puniſhed for originall ſinne in Adam.* ib. p. 145, 146, 147, &c.

R

REdemption was of a double kinde in the Leviticall law. Book 1. p. 143.

Of Reliques, Book 2. chap. 12. *and the Authours eſteem of a true choice Relique.* ibid. p. 130, 131.

The Reſurrection was typified in Samſon; and how. Book 2. p. 31. *Compare* Book 3. p. 220. *at the bottome of the page. Why all men ſhall riſe again at the laſt day.* Book 1. p. 195. *Whether ſuch as have been raiſed from the dead did die the ſecond time.* Book 2. p. 1, *to* p. 12. *Of holy men there is a double reſurrection.* ib. p. 4. *The raiſing of the dead was an act appropriated unto Chriſt himſelf, no way communicated to his Apoſtles, in his life time.* ib. p. 6, 9, 10. *Who they were that roſe at Chriſts death.* ib. p. 12. *wherwith compare* ib. chap. 8. 11, 12, 13, 14. *throughout. The raiſed Saints aſcended not into heaven with Chriſt.* ib. ch. 15, 16, 17, 18. *throughout. Chriſts reſurrection was typified in Elias, 1. King.* 2. 13. ib. p. 146.

The figure of Rome at its firſt building. ib. p. 24.

S

THe whole Scripture is but one, though penned by divers. Book 2. p. 38, 39. *The Penmen of the holy Scriptures, as ſuch, could not forget* ibid. p. 40, 41, &c. *Whether, & how it was neceſſarie that the Scripture ſhould be written for mens inſtruction.* ibid. p. 68, 69, 70, &c. *Whether the holy Penmen of the Scriptures underſtood all that they wrote.* ibid. p. 80, *to* p. 86. *Whether they read profane Authours.* ibid. p. 86, *to* p. 90. *They did cite Poets, or profane Authours.* ibid. p. 89, *to* p. 93. *Whether they ſtudied the things they wrote beforehand.* ib. p. 92, *to* p. 96. *There was no difference between the Penmen of the divine Writ of the Old and New Teſtament in the point of conceiving, and writing in different languages.* ib. p. 96. *We muſt have recourſe unto the alluſions of Scripture which are, not reſt on what the Apoſtles conceived in their mindes onely.* ibid. p. 97. *The Penmen of Scripture had no libertie to put in their own conceits, or, in writing to adde, or blot out what they had done.* ib. p. 98, *to* p. 104. *They had no power to clothe their inward apprehenſions with words of their own.* ib. p. 104, 105, 106. *The Penmen of Scripture wrote their heavenly dictates in the ſame language, in which they conceived them.* ibid. p. 107, *to* p. 112. *Whether the holy Penmen of Scripture*

pture wrote the Scripture casually. ibid. p. 71, 72. *When the New Testament began first to be written, and upon what occasion.* ibid. pag. 73. *Whether the Penmen of Scripture were commanded to write.* ibid. p. 73, *to* page 76. *Whether the Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles were compelled to write.* ibid. 76, *to* p. 80. *Whether Christ wrote any part of Scripture himself immediately.* ibid. p. 64, 65, &c.

Why Sinne is called Originall. Book 1. p. 129. *Styles given to originall sinne.* ib. p. 36. *Some sinnes are greater then other.* ibid. p. 62, 63, 64. *The greatnesse of a sinne is two wayes considered.* ibid. p. 66. *Of originall sinne, as conveyed unto us from Adam.* ib. p. 74, *to* pag. 90. *Originall sinne is matter of repentance.* ib. p. 76. *How we sinned originall sinne in Adam.* ib. p. 78, 79, 80. *Not by imputation onely, nor onely by imitation.* p. 84, 85. *Originall sinne is propagated to mankinde.* ib. p. 90, 91. & p. 129. *When originall sinne beginneth.* ib. p. 91, 92, 93. *The manner how the soul is by it made sinfull.* ib. p. 103, *to* p. 109. *Adams actuall sinne was private, and personall, ideall onely, and representative: therefore not imputed unto us.* ib. p. 88, 89. & p. 129.

The foure principall faculties of our Souls, with their severall objects. Book 1. p. 56.

T

A Twofold kinde of Temperature; the one of weight, the other of justice. Book 1. p. 18.

Tithes are by an everlasting law due to the Priesthood of Melchisedech. ibid. p. 83. *Curses that follow those who sacrilegiously rob the Church of Tithes.* Book 2. p. 50, 51.

The Transfiguration of Christ, with the manner of it, and how it was not painfull to him. B. 1. p. 29.

Of the Translation of them who shall be found alive at the last day ibid. p. 30.

The use of the Tree of life in Paradise unto Adam. ibid. p. 20, & 23. *Whether Adam did eat of the tree of life before he fell.* ibid. p. 21, 22.

V

Viator is considered according unto a twofold estate. Book 1. page 51, 52.

FINIS.

The Table.

A

V

V

FINIS.

The ſeverall places of Scripture explained in theſe three Books of Miſcellanies.

The firſt book.

Gen. 3. 20. 38, 40.
Gen. 4. 15. 64, 65.
Exod. 13. 2. 140.
Exod. 20. 5. 110, 116, 127, 128.
Job 14. 4. 95, 96.
Pſ. 51. 5. 92, 93, 94.
Pſ. 91. 11. 25, 26.
Pſ. 109. 14. 121, 122.
Pſ. 131. 1. 161, 162.
Iſa. 53. 2. 18.
Verſ. 4. 20.
Jer. 25. 26. 153, *unto* 157.
Matt. 15. 14. 174.
Joh. 8. 44. 37.
Joh. 9. 2. 132.
Act. 23. 5. 168, 169, 170, &c.
Rom. 5. 12. 79, 80.
verſ. 13. 186.
ver. 18. *from page* 190, *to the end of the firſt book.*
Rom. 11. 16. 106.
1. Cor. 3. 1, 2. 158.
1. Cor. 7. 14. 106.
1. Cor. 15. 47. 42.
Epheſ. 4. 23, 24. 56.
Heb. 9. 27. *from the* 1, *to the ninth.*

The ſecond book.

Gen. 22. 5. p. 83.
Gen. 31. 53. 32.
John 8. 56. 30, 31.
Joh. 20. 7. 146, 147.
1. Cor. 2. 16. 78.
1. Cor. 16. 22. 48, 49, &c.
2. Cor. 5. 14. 78.
Gal. 6. 11. 67, 68.
Heb. 11. 35. 4.

The third book.

Exod. 34. 29. p. 210.
Mal. 4. 5, 6. 174, 175, &c.
Matt. 17. 11. 177, 178, &c.

¶ Faults escaped in the first Book, thus to be corrected.

Page	lins	for	reade
18	11	*perpetuus*	*propitius.*
20	margin	*dapis*	*dapis.*
24	2	*nec*	*nec est hic,*
29	13	*nec*	*ne.*
	39	ecclipsed	eclipsed.
30	margin	*trans-fumtis*	*trans-sumtis.*
32	margin	*laborantes*	*laborantes.*
44	20	yae	yea.
57	20	he dil for a while	he did fulfill for a while.
62	22	Cittizn	Citizen.
65	30	*Wbeter*	*Wether.*
	43	Genes	Genesis.
82	41	*lisemesse*	*likenesse.*
86	20	this	his.
96	margin	*dostus, nec doctus*	*doctus, nec indoctus*

¶ In the second Book.

2	39	for iſtance	reade	inſtance.

FINIS.

But his opinion is juſtly exploded as hypercritically nice, and Julius Scaligers whip here fetcheth bloud of Eraſmus, *Maximus eſſe potuiſſet, ſi minor eſſe voluiſſet.* He diminiſheth himſelf, by taking upon him to be a *cenſor* of the Scripture. *Nihil parturiens, continuò parit omnia,* ſaith a Papiſt of Eraſmus.

6. Wiſer S. Auguſtine, in Epiſt. 19. ad Hieronymum, thus; [h] *I have learned to give that reverence and honour onely to thoſe books of Scripture which are called Canonicall, that I moſt fully beleeve, no writer thereof erred any Iota.* But if there were *a fail of their memory*, they did *ſomewhat erre*, whatſoever Eraſmus ſhould ſeem to ſuggeſt; who would have taken it in fume, if the Friers his oppoſites had ſaid, there had been in his books *lapſus memoriæ, A fail of memorie.* S. Auguſtine is conſtant to himſelf, and to the truth: for again he ſaith, concerning the Evangeliſts, [i] *The Evangeliſts muſt be ſo farre from lying, that they muſt not fall into an untruth of forgetfulneſſe.* S. Cyril. *lib. 6. in Levitic.* toward the end of his book, aſcending from one particular, ſaith of the whole Scripture, divinely inſpired, [k] *What ſhall we ſay? ſhall we grant forgetfulneſſe in the words of the holy Ghoſt?* And he anſwereth his own queſtion, in generall, [l] *I dare not think ſo of the ſacred Text.*

7. Yea, but ſaith Maſius, *The Syriack tranſlation proves, that this place is faulty: for the Syriack Copies have it thus, Jacob was tranſlated into Sychem, and laid in the grave that Abraham bought for money of the ſonnes of Hemor.* Junius his Syriack accordeth with Maſius; and on that place Junius thus, *The Syriack Interpreter either uſed a diverſe Copie, or his own judgement and authoritie.* Laſtly, the Arabick tranſlation, as it is ſet out by Junius, readeth it correſpondently to the Syriack: and Junius on the Text, in the Arabick tranſlation, preferreth the Arabick and Syriack reading before the Greek; and the meaning of the Arabick and Syriack is this, That Jacob being dead, was carried into the field of the Sychemites; the Egyptians accompanying Joſeph, and the Iſraelites; where *ſeptemdialis luctus, Seven dayes mourning* was made; and after the mourning he was carried again from Sychem to Hebron, to be buried with Abraham. *This is wittily invented,* (ſaith Beza) *yet not to be admitted.* And indeed, Junius himſelf in his Parallels retracts it: and Chorographie ſheweth, it is no wittie invention. For Hebron lieth between Goſhen and Sychem: now that they ſhould carry him from Goſhen, even almoſt through Hebron, it is not likely. Wherefore, to conclude, neither be the Arabick or Syriack Copies of authoritie enough to confront the Greek (for the Greek was not tranſlated out of them, but they out of the Greek) neither may we yeeld, that either the Evangeliſts did *labi memoriâ, fail in their memories*; or that generally, in any place, all the Greek and Latine Copies are corrupted. If it had been a

[h] *Ego ſolis eis Scripturarum libris, qui jam Canonici appellantur, timorem hunc, & honorē didici deferre, ut nullum eorum autorem ſcribendo aliquid errâſſe firmiſſimè credam.*

[i] *Omnem falſitatem abeſſe ab iis decet, non ſolum eam quæ mentiendo promitur, ſed eam etiam quæ obliviſcendo.*
[k] *Quid dicemus? Oblivionem dabimus in verbis Spiritus Sancti?*
[l] *Non audeo hoc de ſacris ſentire ſermonibus.*

literall errour (as Geneſ. 3.15. the Vulgat readeth *ipſa*, for *ipſe* or *ipſum*; or *Dei*, for *diëi*, in Epiſt. Jude, verſ. 6. or *lapides ſeculi*, for *lapidos ſacculi*, Proverb. 16.11. or *viduam ejus*, for *victum ejus*, Pſal. 132.15. or *fontem*, for *fortem*, Pſal. 42.2.) we would yeeld it was the fault of the tranſcriber: but to admit ſuch a corruption, wherein is no ſimilitude of letters, and in all Copies, both Greek and Latine, I cannot like, though more Authours, then Maſius, Beza, Druſius, or Eraſmus, did joyn hand in hand to juſtifie it.

O Infinite Spirit, unſearchable, yet ſearching all things; Omnipotent, yet unable to lie or be untrue; who never didſt lead into errour thy holy Inſtruments, nor ſufferedſt the Pen-men of thy ſacred Scripture to take thy Dictates amiſſe; I humbly beſeech thee to inſpire me with knowledge and zeal, to vindicate thy heavenly Word, and the moſt bleſſed Writers thereof, from imputed corruption, miſtaking, or obliviouſneſſe. Grant this, at the Mediation of my onely Lord and Redeemer, Jeſus Chriſt. Amen.

CHAP. IX.

1. *The ſecond anſwer diſliked. Melchior Canus cenſured for ſaying, S. Steven his memorie failed him. His like proof from Jephthah his miſtaking, anſwered.*

2. *An other argument of his, from* Matth. 2.6. *anſwered.*

3. *Heinſius touched at, Cuſanus rejected, for holding that Adam could have underſtood all languages now in uſe. The manner of the confuſion of tongues at Babel.*

4. *The Oriental languages, a goodly ornament, and neceſſary in ſome places. The Syriack enlightening the Greek.*

5. *The Jewiſh excommunications. Donations to Religious houſes ſealed up with curſes to the infringers. Mr. Selden in part defended, though his Hiſtorie of Tithes hath done hurt. Maran-atha. The Amphibologie of Act. 3.21. cleared by the Syriack. Ubiquitaries with Illyricus taxed. Heavens, and Heaven, taken for God.*

6. *Heinſius ſtrictly examined, and rejected.*

7. *Things granted:* viz. *The inſpirations and conceptions of*

holy Pen-men were under one or other language: in which conceptions they could not erre; nor could they erre in writing.

8. *Queſtions handled at large: Whether it were neceſſary that the Scripture ſhould be written: Whether the ſacred writers wrote caſually: Whether they were commanded to write: Whether they were compelled to write: Whether they underſtood all that they wrote: Whether they did reade profane Authours: Whether they ſtudied the things beforehand.*

9. *Concluſions againſt Heinſius. There was no difference between the Pen-men of the Divine writ of the Old and New Teſtament, in the point of conceiving and writing in different languages. We are not to have recourſe to the thoughts of S. John, rather then his words. They had no libertie left them, to put in their own conceits, or in writing to adde or blot out what they had done. They had no libertie to cloath their inward apprehenſions with words of their own. They did not conceive in one language, and write in another.*

1 THus then, the conſtant and uniform accordance of the Greek and Latine Copies being held for Authenticall and Canonicall, and all manner of corruption and generall aberration in any one letter being wholly removed; there is invented a ſecond way of anſwer, groſſe and abſurd; which I diſlike as ill, if not worſe then the former. A defender of it is Melchior Canus, *de Locis Theologicis, lib. 2. cap. 18.* toward the end of that book and chapter. For he would ſeem to gather from Beda and Rabanus, *That it happened to Steven, as to other common people; namely, that in a long narration, eſpecially if it be ſudden, he hath mingled and confounded ſome things, [a] And forgot himſelf in ſome things, to wit, in ſuch things as belonged little or nothing to the purpoſe: for he was buſily muſing, and intent upon the main matter. But* (ſaith he) *S. Luke writing the hiſtorie, changed not one jot, but writ as Steven ſpoke. Now we need not defend Steven from all errour and fault* (ſaith he) *but we muſt quit the Evangeliſt. For onely the Prophets, Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts, did never labi memoriâ, or erre in any matter, great or ſmall, other men did.* His proofs are theſe.

[a] *In quibuſdam etiam memoriâ lapſus fuerit.*

Jephthah in Judges 11. 26. pretendeth 300 yeares poſſeſſion, when they were not ſo many: and the divine Pen-man or Hiſtoriographer, writeth as Jephthah pretended, and eſtabliſhed not the truth of the thing it ſelf.

I anſwer, that Salianus, in his *Annales, Anno Mundi* 2849, maketh

keth one account, wherein the time of the Iſraelites coming out of Egypt, to the inſtant of Jephthahs arguing, is 377 yeares: and from the death of Sihon king of the Amorites, 337 yeares. But the truth is, (if we will hit the exact number) both Salianus and Tremellius, and many others ſay, That from the coming out of Egypt, and from the giving of the Law, unto this preſent controverſie of Jephthah with the King of the Amorites, there were 305, or 306 yeares expired. And Tremellius well obſerveth, that Jephthah began his narration from their coming forth of Egypt, verſ. 16. Therefore thence beginneth the number, and the reckoning. Now the ſhortning of an account, is an uſuall Ellipſis, both in Scripture, and in other Authours. The 70 Interpreters are cited for 72. Among the Romanes, the *Centum-viri* conſiſted of one hundred and five men. Judges 20. 46. *all which fell of Benjamin that day, were* 25000. yet there fell that day 100 more, verſ. 35. So 2. Sam. 5. 5. the account is ſhortened by ſix moneths leſſe then was ſet down in the precedent verſe; it being [b] *A frequent Synecdoche, to make a round and ſmooth reckoning*, ſaith Tremellius. If any ſhall yet contend, that Jephthah ſaith expreſly, v. 26. *Iſrael dwelt in Heſhbon and her towns; and in Aroer and her towns; and in all the cities that be along by the coaſts of Arnon*, 300 *yeares*; Peter Martyr on the place anſwereth, That the Scripture-account often followeth the greater number. Now becauſe the yeares from Sihons death, were nearer 300. then 200. Jephthah reckoneth not the refract, but the whole number; and accounteth them 300 yeares, as inclining to the greater number. For Sihon was overcome, and ſlain the laſt yeare of Moſes his life; *being to the preſent debate, 266 yeares*, ſaith Abulenſis; 267, ſaith Lyranus; 270 *yeares*, ſaith Peter Martyr. If Peter Martyrs anſwer be ſleighted, I adde, that the perfection of Scriptures ſtands not ſo ſtrictly on exactneſſe of number, but that it puts a certain number for an uncertain. Inſtances are obvious. So, *while we plead too much for number, we ſhall*, as S. Auguſtine ſaith, *forget, or neglect, both weight and meaſure*. Laſtly, grant that Jephthah either miſtook, or miſpleaded the yeares, in a braving faſhion; and ſay, that the holy Ghoſt hath penned, not what was truth in it ſelf, but what Jephthah alledged erroneouſly, or covetouſly, for his preſcription (for Jephthah had more then one errour:) yet, it followeth not, that S. Steven was deceived; for he was *full of the holy Ghoſt*, when he ſpake this, Act. 7. 55. and before he ſpake this, he was *full of faith, and of the holy Ghoſt*, Act. 6. 5. *Full of faith and power*, verſ. 8. and they that diſputed with Steven, *were not able to reſiſt the wiſdome and the ſpirit, by which he ſpake*, v. 10. Therefore he ſpake wiſely, truely, and by the Spirit, as well as S. Luke wrote by the Spirit, and neither of them could in this

[b] *Synecdoche frequens, ad rotunditatem numeri.*

paſſage erre, though Jephthah be held a man of imperfections.

2. *Secondly*, ſaith Canus, *the Evangeliſt hath it, Matth.* 2. 6. *That* IT IS WRITTEN BY THE PROPHET, AND THOU BETHLEHEM, IN THE LAND OF JUDAH, ART NOT THE LEAST AMONG THE PRINCES OF JUDAH, *when it is not ſo written by the prophet; who ſaith, Micah* 5. 2. BUT THOU BETHLEHEM EUPHRATA, THOUGH THOU BE LITTLE AMONG THE THOUSANDS OF JUDAH; *the ſenſe being very different, almoſt contrary.* In which place S. Matthew reports the words, not as they are in Micah; but as the chief Prieſts and Scribes recited them to Herod. [c] *Which teſtimonie* (ſaith Hierome on Micah 5. 2.) *agreeth neither with the Hebrew, nor the Seventie; as is plain, though I ſay nothing.* Then followeth his opinion, [d] *I think that S. Matthew being willing to reprove the negligence of the Scribes and Prieſts, toward the reading of holy Scriptures, related the words, as they were cited by them.* So that though the Scribes and Phariſees were blinde, and, ſeeing the Prophet through a vail, took one thing for an other; and though the Evangeliſt purpoſely reciteth their miſtaking, that we might diſcern the fault of theſe ill guides, and ignorant teachers; yet it no way followeth, that S. Steven did erre, or was miſtaken, or that S. Luke miſreported the words of S. Steven. But enough of this, to teſtifie my diſlike of the ſecond opinion, and of ſuch, who excuſing the Greek Text from corruption, (wherein I wonderfully applaud them) do impute an errour and ſlip unto the holy, powerfull, gracefull, truth-ſpeaking, and dying Protomartyr, S. Steven (which I cannot endure in them.) And certes, both theſe former rejected opinions are built on a falſe ground, and idlely do preſuppoſe, that there is no reall hiſtoricall truth in the words, as they are in the Greek, and in the Latine Text. But truth there is, and though truth lie deep hid, *as in a well* (ſaid he of old;) yet, by Gods help, we ſhall winde her up, and draw her above ground, that every eye may ſee her, though we have many turnings.

3. Which that I may the better accompliſh, I muſt ſtraggle awhile after two moſt learned men, Cardinall Cuſanus, and Daniel Heinſius; eſpecially Heinſius; whom when I have overtaken, and wrung and wonne from him ſome holds, which are offenſive to the majeſtie of ſacred Scripture, then ſhall I return, and deſcend to the moſt difficult place of Acts 7. 16, &c.

The learned worthie Heinſius (whom I name not without honour, though I diſſent from him) in his Exercitations upon Nonnus, and in the *Prolegomena*, beats out certain paths, which never any on the earth trode upon, before him; pag. 27. making the Helleniſticall language to be the beſt interpreter of the Hebrew and Chaldee, and the Hebrew and Chaldee, interchangeably, the beſt interpreters of it.

[c] *Quod teſtimonium nec Hebraico textui, nec 70 Interpretibus convenire, me quoque tacente, perſpicuum eſt.*
[d] *Arbitror, Matthæum volentem arguere Scribarum & Sacerdotum erga divinæ Scripturæ lectionem negligentiam, ſic etiam poſuiſſe, ut ab iis dictum eſt.*

Before

Before all his words or my anſwer be recited, I think fit to premiſe theſe things:

Firſt, If Heinſius mean onely to extoll the knowledge of the Helleniſticall language, and of the Chaldee and Syriack; I aſſent unto him: nor ſhall any man, in right, aſcribe more to the holy mother of them all, and of all other languages, the primitive Hebrew, the language of God (when he ſpake audibly) and of Angels, unto men, then I will. Yet the pureſt gold may be over-valued, and the very ſhekel of the Sanctuarie thought heavier then it is. And indeed I ſhould be loath to ſay, what the moſt learned Cardinall Cuſanus hath written in his *Compendium, cap. 3. pag. 240.* [e] *It is not abſurd to beleeve, that the firſt art of ſpeaking was ſo copious, and full of many Synonymaes, that all the afterward-divided tongues were in it contained: For all languages are derived from our firſt parent Adams language. And as there is not a tongue which man underſtandeth not; ſo even Adam (who was no other then a man) could underſtand any language if he heard it: For he was the ὀνοματοθέτης, who impoſed names upon the creatures; and therefore no word of any other language was originally inſtituted by any other. Neither are we to wonder at this in Adam, when it is certain, that by the gift of God many have ſuddenly obtained, and ſpeedily were inſpired with the skill and knowledge of all languages.* So farre Cuſanus.

That there is no language under heaven, but hath ſome words retaining the foot-ſteps of the Hebrew, I beleeve; and in the languages which I underſtand, I can demonſtrate: but that Adam could underſtand all languages now ſpoken, if he had heard them, is not credible. When God confounded their language, Geneſ. 11.7. &c. *the language of all the earth*, he did it to this end, that they might not underſtand one anothers ſpeech. The confuſion was not of inventing of new letters, vowels, and conſonants; for they are ſtill the ſame: and if there were ſeventie two languages, as ſay the Ancient, Hierom, Auguſtine, Proſper, Epiphanius; or but fiftie five, (as our Modern writers conjecture) anſwerable to their families, Geneſ. 10. yea two thouſand foure hundred languages more, they might all be uttered by the firſt two and twenty letters: Nor was it onely ſuch a confuſion, as when the ſweet ſinging of the nightingales is undiſtinguiſhable through the obſtreperouſneſſe of gagling geeſe, and chattering daws. For if at the beginning of that confuſion every one had ſpoken to another articulately and diſtinctly, *alternis vicibus*; they could not have underſtood, what either ſaid; though afterward by uſe, each familie underſtood themſelves, as we may dumbe men. But the confuſion conſiſted in this, That God took away from all, ſave the family of Heber, the habituall, or actuall knowledge of the Hebrew tongue; emptying the treaſuries of their memories, both ſenſi-

[e] *Nec abſurdum videtur, ſi creditur primam dicendi artē adeò fuiſſe copioſam, ex multis Synonymis, quòd omnes poſtea linguæ diviſæ in ipſa continebātur. Omnes enim linguæ humanæ ſunt ex prima illa parentis noſtri, Adæ ſcilicet hominis, lingua. Et ſicut non eſt lingua quam homo non intelligit; ità & Adam (quidē quod homo) nullam, ſi audiret, ignoraret. Ipſe enim vocabula legitur impoſuiſſe; ideo nullum cujuſque linguæ vocabulum ab alio fuit originaliter inſtitutum. Nec de Adam mirandum, cùm certum ſit, dono Dei, multos linguarum omnium peritiam ſubitò habuiſſe.*

ſenſitive and intellective, from all and every old note, impreſſion, character, figure, or ſpecies.

Secondly, when by an univerſall ἀμνησία, or oblivion, he had drowned or blotted out all former conceptions; he prompted readily unto them new forms, and furniſhed their intellectualls with new notions; which the pliable obedience of the tongue (at firſt not knowing what it ſaid) uttered in new words and languages; by the tranſpoſition and tranſ-changing, adding or diminiſhing of a letter, or letters. See Avenarius, drawing almoſt all Greek, and our Minſhaw, many languages from the Hebrew. But if they retained the ſame ſyllable, and the ſame word; yet in one language it ſignified one thing, and in another, another thing; as *ſus* ſignifieth, in the Hebrew, an *horſe*; with the Flaunderkins, *ſilence*; among the Latines, an *hogge*: as Cornelius à Lapide hath obſerved. Nor think I, that Noah (who lived at the confuſion of Babel; and was born within ſevenſcore yeares of Adams death) could underſtand all their languages, without much commerce, ſtudie, or divine revelation. Beſides all this, all ages have made and framed new words; nor is any time to be blamed,

——— *ſi nova rerum*
Nomina protulerit, ——— *If it coyn new names:*

it was lawfull, and is yet, — *dabitúrque licentia ſumpta pudenter, It ſhall be lawfull, ſo it be done modeſtly without enforcement*, ſaith Horace, *De arte Poetica*. And though there were but few yeares, about half a mans age, between the firſt and ſecond Punick warre; yet the articles of peace made at the end of the firſt warre, were hardly underſtood at the ſecond, as may be gathered from Polybius. What ſpeak I of words, when new languages have ſprung up, more then ever were at the confuſion of Babel? If God at the overthrow of Babel coyned or ſtamped the Greek; and if Adam could have underſtood it; were all its dialects diſtinguiſhed, or no? and the Helleniſticall Greek, or Grecanick language? (that I may uſe ſome of Heinſius his words.) And if thoſe were then ſpoken, and then intelligible; was the now common corrupt Greek misformed? or could Adam underſtand that, which Plato or Ariſtotle would ſweat to expound? If the Teutonick were then ſpoken; was the Saxon, Engliſh, Scotiſh, &c. (the derivatives from it, as Verſtegan and others will have it) then in uſe? If the Latine was framed in Babel; was it the firſt old blunt Latine, or the refined? If the refined; was the Valachian, Italian, Spaniſh, French, (the Provinciall tongues of Rome, if I may ſo call them) at that time ſpoken? I could be plentifull herein. But I paſſe unto the objections of Cuſanus, which ſhall receive this ſatisfaction in order.

Obiect. 1.

Object. 1. *The first art of humane speech was copious by many Synonymaes.*

I answer, The Hebrew had but few Synonymaes, few primitive Radixes, in comparison of other languages; many words signifying contrary things, every one divers things: nor did Adam speak any but Hebrew, nor needed he know any more. Cicero cried out of old,* *O word-wanting Greece!* and much more Judea, say I.

* *O inops verborum Gracia!*

Object. 2. *All languages came from the Hebrew which Adam spake.*

I confesse it, *quoad fundamenta sermonum, id est, quoad literas.* There were no new letters stamped or added to the first: but the tongues themselves came after divers descents: so that many languages now in use may acknowledge other mothers; though even those mothers were grand-children, or daughters of the Hebrew: neither of which, by reason of the long tract of time, and the insensible degrees of their growing, could know one another, if they could meet.

Object. 3. *As there is no language but some man understandeth, so there is no language but Adam, who signifieth a man, could understand if he heard.*

I answer, The word *Adam* is homonymous, and the similitude unlike, and disjoynted.

Object. 4. *But Adam imposed names on all things: therefore no man else originally invented any other name.*

I answer, He saith true, if he confine his meaning to the Hebrew, to that *Origo originans.* But that Adam called Cheese, *Coise*; or Cattell, *Catalla*; or a Chappel, *Capella*; a learned man should not think.

Object. 5. *Oh, but some, by Gods gift, had the knowledge of all tongues: then wonder not if Adam had.*

I answer, They had the gift of all tongues then necessarie to be spoken or understood; perchance of all tongues then in being: that as when people inclined to idolatrie, the diversitie of tongues was introduced; so when they were to be reconciled to Christ, the cloven tongues sitting on the Apostles, might finde a remedie for that diversitie, by the gift of languages. Yet saith Aquinas, 2ª. 2æ. quæst. 176. art. 1. ad 1. [f] *The Apostles were taught from heaven the languages of all nations, so farre forth as was requisite for the doctrine of faith; but for points of elegancie, the Apostles were onely skilfull in their own tongue. As in wisdome and knowledge they were sufficiently instructed, so farre as the doctrine of faith required; but they were not furnished* (saith he) *with acquisite knowledge, or conclusions Arithmeticall, or Geometricall.* Thus farre Aquinas. But that they understood or spake tongues which since have sprung up, is not likely: no more did Adam.

[f] *Instructi fuerunt divinitus in linguis omnium gentium, quantum requirebatur ad fidei doctrinam, &c.*

That

That Adam could have done it by Gods miraculous power, I confeſſe: that he could out-weather any meer man by his naturall gifts, I beleeve: what he could have done by labour or ſtudie in a little time, if he had heard or read any language, I will not queſtion; ſince man hath found out the language of Hieroglyphicks; and the tongue of characters hath been read; and if you place conſtantly ſeverall things in the room of ſeverall letters, a dog for A, a tooth for B, a lion for C, and the like; a little practiſe will diſcover the true meaning. But my controverſie with Cuſanus is, What Adam could do ſuddenly, naturally, and ordinarily, if he heard our mongrell Neoterick languages. He is for the affirmative, That Adam underſtood them, or could underſtand them. I am for the negative.

4. But I muſt return to Heinſius, with whom I will acknowledge, that the Orientall languages are of infinite worth, moſt neceſſarie to be ſtudied, exacting as much labour and pains before they be gained, as they afford delight and profit ſpirituall when they are obtained; yea, I heartily wiſh, that even the learned would not preſume to interpret the harder places of Scripture, unleſſe they be furniſhed with knowledge in the Eaſtern tongues: much leſſe ſhould the ignorant Laicks expound it. Thoſe beaſts ought not to touch this mountain.

That I may omit many memorable paſſages concerning the Old Teſtament, I ſay, that an unuſuall ſplendour from the Syriack, hath fully inlightned many places of the New Teſtament, which lay in darkneſſe. View two inſtances.

5. What was the meaning of *Anathema Maranatha*, 1. Cor. 16. 22. was long unknown, long ſought after in vain; as being impoſſible to be found in the Greek or Latine languages, how copious ſoever: in the end, it was traced to be an Idiotiſme of the Syriack; and a phraſe borrowed from the uſance and practiſe of the Jews: for their politie had three ſorts of Excommunication. The firſt called *Niddui*, which regularly was a ſeparation for thirty dayes: during which time, the excommunicated perſon muſt keep himſelf foure cubits aloof from all men and women in all places. The Evangeliſt ſeemeth to touch at this, when he recordeth the Conſtitution of the Jews; that, *if any confeſſed Chriſt*, συνοδὸν γένηται, *extra Synagogam fieret, He ſhould be put out of the Synagogue*, as the laſt Tranſlation well expounds it, Joh. 9. 22.

The ſecond, and heavier degree was called *Cherem*; in the Greek Ἀνάθεμα: in the Latine, by the Livian phraſe, *Devotorius*; by the Ceſarean, *Devotus*. It were eaſie to mention ſome, who have vowed-away themſelves, as that reſolute young Romane Knight, Marcus Curtius, (ſee it in Livie *lib. 6.*) and the

ſoldurii

ſoldurii (from whence in likelihood cometh the name of *ſouldiers*) in Ceſars commentaries conditionally devoted.

——Deciique caput fatale voventes;
And the Decii vowing their own deſtruction.

Alſo, at ſeverall times and places, divers others, both captives and natives, have been dedicated to the infernall deities. To which, in the ſpirituall cenſure of Chriſtian Excommunication, there is ſome alluſion, where S. Paul delivered Hymeneus and Alexander unto Satan, 1. Tim. 1. 20. and 1. Cor. 5. 5. where he likewiſe decreed the like ſentence againſt the inceſtuous Corinthian.

The third and higheſt ſtep in this Excommunication, is called *Anathema Maranatha*, Μαραναθὰ for ſo ſome reade it in the Greek; alſo moſt of the Latine Bibles make it all one word, *Maranatha*; others, *Maranata*, ſaith Cornelius à Lapide. *What it did ſignifie, g the learned Divines long and much endeavoured to know: and all much laboured to finde the fountain and origination of that Anathema*, ſaith Bertram in the Preface on his compariſon of the Hebrew and Aramean Grammar. Elias, *in Thisb.* ſaith, MARA *ſignifieth* DOMINUS; and ſo the letter ן, is paragogicall: And *it may be read*, DOMINUS VENIT, *The Lord cometh*, ſaith Peter Martyr. Likewiſe for the language, *Some* (ſaith he) *think it is h one Syriack word, i Half Hebrew half Syriack*, as Cornelius à Lapide hath it. *k It is more Syriack then Hebrew*, ſaith Hierom, *Epiſt.* 137. *ad Marcel.* *l Though* (as he addeth) *it ſomewhat ſounds like Hebrew, by the neareneſſe and proximitie of thoſe languages.* In the perfect Hebrew, *Marenuatha*, is, *Dominus noſter venit*, *Our Lord cometh*. ATHA is uſed Deut. 33. 2. אתה, *Et venit*. That MAR, MARA, or MARAN, is uſed for *Dominus*, till after the Babyloniſh captivitie, I reade not. What in the Hebrew is MORE, in the Chaldee is MAR; MAR *Dominus*; MARA or MARIA, *Domina*. *Some Chriſtians of the Eaſt at this day call their Prelates* MAR-ABRAHAM, MAR-JOSEPH; ſaith Cornelius à Lapide. Yea, *the whole ſentence is Chaldaick* (if ye beleeve the learned Eſtius:) *at large*, MARANA-ATHA; *contracted*, MARAN-ATHA. He alſo hath a wittie relation, That the Jews, before Chriſts coming, were wont ordinarily to have this word in their mouths, *Maran*, in expectancie of *Chriſt the Lord*; and on every occaſion with reference to him, MARAN, *Our Lord, He will come, he cometh*; MARAN, MARAN. But after Chriſt was born indeed, and God took on him our nature, and many Jews beleeved; whenſoever the unbeleeving brethren ſtill cried their old MARAN, as if the Meſſiah were not come; the beleevers anſwered, ATHA, to their MARAN; MARAN-ATHA, *Our Lord is come*: which becauſe the other would not beleeve, they were called *Marani*, and *Maranita*, from their iterated *Muran*, and rejecting of *Maran-atha*.

g *Viri doctos Theologos torſit.*

h *Una dictio Syriaca.*
i *Vox Hebræo-Syriaca.*
k *Magis Syrum eſt quàm Hebraum.*
l *Tametſi ex confinio utrarumque linguarum aliquid & Hebraum ſonet.*

Baronius *in fine Anni* 775. reporteth from Mariana, in his Spaniſh ſtorie, 7. 6. That a gift was given to a Monaſterie; and the violatour of that donation, *jubetur eſſe Anathema, Marrano, & Excommunicatus.* Where the word is not taken (as ſome ſuſpect) *à Mauris, from the Moors*; becauſe moſt of them (in Italie) renounced their Chriſtianitie in the dayes of Frederick Enobarbus; for he reigned 360 yeares, and more, after that gift: but rather, *it is to be borrowed from the Syriack*, MARAN-ATHA, ſaith Mariana, commended by Baronius.

The conſideration of which curſe and excommunication, ſtrikes horrour to my ſoul, in compaſſion of thoſe who have raiſed their houſes out of the ruines of things ſacred with ſuch dreadfull imprecations, and feed themſelves fat with revenews properly belonging to the Altar. If man had not curſed ſuch ſacrilegious infringers, God would: but Founders have blaſted them with lightning and thunder from heaven. What ſaith King Stephen in confirmation of his gift to the Priorie of Eye in Suffolk, cited by M. Selden in his Hiſtorie of Tithes, *cap.* 11. *pag.* 350? *Whoſoever ſhall willingly and wittingly take away, diminiſh, or diſturb any one of all theſe things which are contained in this Charter: By the authoritie of God Omnipotent, the Father, Sonne, and holy Ghoſt, and of all the Apoſtles and Saints, let him be excommunicated and anathematized, and ſequeſtred from the companie of the Lord, and not be admitted into the Church till he repent.* By which words he intended to terrifie ſucceſsion, and to keep them from ſacriledge. Let the world know that there are many, and, as it falleth out now, too many ſuch direfull execrations annexed by holy Benefactours, to eternize their gifts: And as that good King ſaid of himſelf, That he was [m] *Willing to partake with them who by an happie commerce exchange earth for heaven*: So I fear, that the ſacrilegious Uſurpers have indeed exchanged *Heaven* for *Mammon*; and I pray to God that ſuch devout and deliberate maledictions hang not over their poſteritie to this day, nor may extend beyond the firſt Atheiſticall cormorants.

The ſame M. Selden in his book called *Marmora Arundelliana, pag.* 65. mentioneth a Chriſtian inſcription which (as he conjectureth) both prayed to the moſt holy Mother of God for ſuch as were Benefactours to a Monaſterie; and curſed them who did it any damage, with the imprecations of divers holy men; wiſhing, that whoſoever did ſo, might in the day of judgement have againſt him for an adverſarie the ſame moſt holy Mother of God. Theſe things I have related out of that moſt learned Antiquarie, my worthy friend M. Selden, rather then the like out of other Authours; becauſe I would not have either Clergie or Laitie conceit of him (as full many do) that he intended as great a devaſtation to our tithes con-

[l] *Quicunque aliquid de his quæ in hac charta continentur, auferre, aut minuere, aut diſturbare ſcienter voluerit; auctoritate Domini Omnipotentis, Patris, & Filii, & Spiritûs Sancti, & ſanctorum Apoſtolorum, & omnium Sanctorum, ſit excommunicatus, anathematizatus, & à conſortio Domini, & liminibus Sanctæ Eccleſiæ ſequeſtratus, donec reſipiſcat.*

[m] *Volens partem habere cum iis qui felici commercio cæleſtia pro terrenis commutant.*

conſecrated by God and to God; by a double *Jus divinum*, as ever the Black-ſmiths ſonne brought upon Religious houſes; or that he was the inſtrument of ungracious Politicians; or his book the trumpet to animate the armies of the deſtroyers againſt the pitifull poore remnants of our Church, not enough (forſooth) as yet reformed; that is, not enough beggarly: though ſome poiſon in that book hath already wrought ſo piercingly upon us, that our hair is fallen from our heads, and our nails from our fingers, as needing no more paring; and in the caſes of our tithes we are ſhaved and cut worſe then the meſſengers of peace, 2. Sam. 10. 4. Yet ſaith M. Selden himſelf in his Review, pag. 471. *The many execrations annexed to the deeds of conveyance of them, and poured forth againſt ſuch as ſhould divert them to profane uſes, ſhould be alſo thought on:* Not onely thought on, ſay I, but trembled at, till the houre of reſtitution. And let them remember alſo who ſaith, That *it is a deſtruction for a man to devoure what is conſecrated*, Prov. 20. 25. which deſtruction is damnation; not cared for by our devouring Eſaus, if they may fill their bellies with our hallowed morſels; as appeared in thoſe whirl-winde-dayes of Henrie the eighth, and would have appeared ſince, if God had not ruled the heart of religious King James, of moſt happie memorie, and of our ſacred Soveraigne (to whom we of the Clergie do more eſpecially pray God to ſend all happineſſe, equall to his deſires on earth, and a more glorious eſtate among bleſſed Saints, then he hath now among men) to keep the commandments of their and our God, above any worldly benefit.

I muſt return back to *Maran-atha*; whoſe compoſition is thus, as Martyr opineth. The firſt part of it, is the Noun MARA: the ſecond is an affix of the poſſeſsive Pronoun, of the firſt perſon, with the number of multitude, making MARA to be MARAN: the third particle and the cloſe is the Verb ATHA, *venit*. Moreover, concerning the tenſe of the Verb there is queſtion. Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, Theophylact reade it *in tempore præterito*, ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἦλθε, *Our Lord is come*; with whom agree Hierom and Eſtius: others will have it to be the preſent tenſe; ſpeaking as if he did come preſently, becauſe he ſhall come certainly; and becauſe none can ſay, he ſhall not come at this preſent. This tenſe Cornelius à Lapide approveth, on this conſideration, becauſe the Jews condemning any were wont to do ſo, under the commination and conteſtation of the inſtant divine judgement, as Pſal. 9. 19. *Ariſe, O Lord, —let the heathen be judged in thy ſight:* or rather, ſaith Lapide, it may be in the Optative, MARAN-ATHA, *Veniat Dominus:* howſoever he is peremptorie, that it is a cold expoſition which applieth the words to the Preterperfect tenſe;

and the meaning to the firſt coming of Chriſt.

Let me adde, that whether the word be read in the Preſent tenſe in the Indicative, or in the Optative mood, *Venit*, or, *veniat*; *He cometh*, or *let him come*; it pointeth not at the paſt, but at the future coming of Chriſt. Yea, Jude 14. (where the word ἦλθε is uſed) our Tranſlation hath it, *The Lord cometh*; and the words immediately following, make it to have apparent, and undeniable reference to the laſt judgement. Nor were the words *Maran-atha* taken from Moſes, Deut. 33. 2. though he ſaith, *The Lord came with* 11000 *of Saints:* where is a great ſimilitude of ſome particulars; for there is related what paſſed at the deliverie of the Law; and neither *Mara* nor *Maran* is mentioned; but rather by the ſemblance of words we may think Moſes alluded to the propheſie of Enoch, which long after this S. Jude citeth expreſly, as propheſying of future puniſhment to be inflicted for the breach of the Law. And indeed Ambroſe well expounds our *Maran-atha* of the ſecond coming of Chriſt: ſo Clemens Romanus, *Epiſt. 2. in fine.* Auguſtine *Epiſt.* 178 thus, *Anathema, condemnatus, Maran-atha, definiunt, Donec Dominus rédeat; Condemned till the Lord return to judgement.*

Moſt true it is, *Maran-atha* is added, to exaggerate the power of the Execration, and that it is a form of Execration: ſo was it in the intent of the Donor in Mariana. The Talmudiſts ſay, it ſignifieth one delivered into the hand of the Tormentour, by the judgement of the Lord himſelf. Anſwerable it is in ſenſe, to the words in the 17. Chapter of the 6. Councel of Toledo; [l] *May he be perpetually anathematized*: and Chapter 18.[m] *Being ſtricken thorough with the divine curſe, without all hope of remedy let him be eſteemed damned by the eternall judgement.* Therefore indeed fooliſh were they, who thought *Anathema Maran-atha*, to be a kinde of oath; as if S. Paul adjured them, by the coming of Chriſt; yet ſo ſome held, ſaith Peter Martyr. More fooliſh was Cornelius à Lapide the Jeſuit, who on the place confeſſing the words to be [n] *Words of imprecation, of commination of the eternall damnation*; yea *words of condemnation:* acknowledging alſo, that *Muran-atha*, is *Anathema*, like to *Haſſchammata*, being uſually contracted to *Schammata*, which was generally known to be an excommunication of an high form; adding alſo, that [o] *Maranus and a man excommunicate for apoſtaſie are Synonymaes:* yet for all theſe things, by himſelf avouched, ſaith expreſly, [*] *They are not words of one that excommunicateth.* But indeed they are words of an excommunication, taken from the minatorie propheſie of Enoch, recited by S. Jude, verſe 14. *The Lord cometh*; [p] *From thence therefore every man ſeeeth that Anathema is deduced, and that according to the Hebrew guiſe it is called Anathema, from the beginning or firſt words of that curſe: which words are*

[l] *Perpetuò Anathemate damnetur.*

[m] *Anathemate divino perculſus, abſque ullo remedii loco habeatur damnatus æterno judicio.*

[n] *Verba execrantis, & denuntiantis æternam damnationem*, imò *verba condemnantis.*

[o] *Maranus eſt idem, quod κάθαρμα, excommunicatus ob apoſtaſiam.*

[*] *Non ſunt verba excommunicantis.*

[p] *Indè ergò nemo non videt deductam illam Anathematis rationem, & ex primis illius Anathematis verbis, minùs aliàs ad alia aliarum ſententiarum initia uſitatis, Anathema ipſum de more Hebræorum appellatum fuiſſe.*

are otherwise lesse used to the beginnings of other sentences, saith the learned Bertram. *Maran-atha* is [q] *The highest and greatest degree of excommunication among the Jews*, saith Drusius in his Henoch, pag. 29. who addeth, concerning the Apocryphall books of Henoch, that the Jews say, they have them yet, to this day. From whence it is likely, both that the Jews took their form of excommunication, and from the first words of the curse, *Maran-atha*, might denominate the intire *Anathema*, *Maran-atha*: as from the beginnings of writs, or from the principall words, many of our Common-law-writs are so called aswell as the decrees of Popes.

[q] *Extremum genus excommunicationis apud Hebraeos.*

Nor let any object the unlikelihood, that this *Anathema* is taken from Enochs propheſie, becauſe S. Jude hath it not, like *Maran-atha*, κύριος ἦλθε, but ἦλθε κύριος. I answer, that neither Hebrew, nor Syriack, nor our English, so well endure the placing of the Verb before the Noun, as the Greek doth; but followeth naturally the naturall sequele of the words: and not onely when Enoch spake it, but when S. Jude first wrote in the Syriack (if in it he wrote) that was *Maran-atha*, what after, by the Spirit was changed into ἦλθε κύριος· and the meaning is all one; whether it be κύριος ἦλθε, or ἦλθε κύριος, the Noun must be construed before the Verb, *The Lord cometh, Maran-atha*. This excommunication S. Paul briefly and in two words reciteth, as an usance of the Jewish Synagogue; and fit to be introduced into the Christian Temples, and exercised in Ecclesiasticall discipline. So much of that.

An other instance is in Act. 3. 21. What is in the Latine and Greek full of Amphibologie, diversely, at divers editions, rendered by Beza and others, is plain, & radiant in the Syriack; Ὃν δεῖ μὲν οὐρανὸν δέξασθαι, *Quem oportet quidē cælum recipere*, saith the vulgat; *The sentence is altogether doubtfull both in Greek and Latine*, saith Bellarmine, Tom. 1. pag. 409. whether *Jesus suscipiat cœlum*, or *cœlum Jesum*, as Cajetan openeth the case. Now the Syriack, translated by Tremellius, hath it, *Quem oportet cœli capiant*; *Quem necesse est cœlis ut capiant*, as it is varied by the skilfull Linguist Bertram; *Quem oportet cœlum ut capiat*, saith the Arabick; all running to the second exposition, that the heavens must contain Christ.

Which words being firm against the Ubiquitaries, they interpret *Cœlum*, not properly, but figuratively, for the glorie, reigne, and majestie of God. [r] *For otherwise, if he had meant the place of Heaven, it would have been said, Who must be received into Heaven:* So Illyricus, *in lib. de Ascensione Christi.* But Illyricus must not teach the holy Ghost how to speak; nor be offended, if the All-wise Divine Spirit use an Amphibolous phrase in the Greek, which is cleared by the more Eastern tongues. In my opinion, he might rather have said, that, perhaps, by *Heaven*

[r] *Alioqui enim, si sermo esset de loco, dictum esset; Quem oportet cælo recipi.*

God is meant; both becauſe our bleſſed Saviours laſt words were, Luke 23. 46. *Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit*; which moſt certainly was received into the hands of his Father in heaven; as alſo, for that not onely the word *Cæli*, in the plurall number, is taken for God; according to the uſe of the Aramæans and alſo of the Jews; as appeareth in the record containing the jointure and dowrie which Rabbi Moſes made to Clarora, the daughter of Rabbi David, explained by Bertram, at the end of his Aramæan and Hebrew Grammar; where the Bridegroom ſaith (among other things) [t] *Be thou a wife to me according to the law of Moſes and Iſrael: and I according to Gods commandment will worſhip, honour, keep & govern thee:* ſomewhat according, as in our marriages, the husband promiſeth to worſhip, comfort, honour, and keep his wife: ſave onely that the Jew did promiſe to govern his wife, which we leave out: which is alſo conſonant to the authentick Hebrew, Daniel 4. 26. *Dominantes Cæli*, or *Cæli dominentur*, *The Heavens do rule*, as it is in our late Tranſlation; that is, *God in the Heavens doth rule*: But alſo becauſe (the Jews, in reverence and fear, avoiding the naming of *Jehova*, and calling him, among many other attributes, *Cælum*) our Saviour repreſenting in this hiſtoricall parable the perſon of a young penitent Jew, ſpeaketh as the Jew would, and placeth the word *Heaven* in the ſingular number for God. Luke 15. 18. *Father, I have ſinned againſt Heaven.* Likewiſe Matth. 21. 25. *The baptiſme of John, whence was it? from Heaven, or of men?* it is not *from Heaven*, or *from Earth*; but *from Heaven*; *or of men*; not a *place*, but *perſons* are to be underſtood; and in Heaven, rather God then Angels: and if likelihood lead us to expound it of Angels (as it doth not) yet thoſe Angels repreſented God, and were ſo called in his ſtead. And thus we will paſſe from this point.

[t] *Eſto mihi in uxorem, juxta legem Moſis & Iſrael; & ego, ex verbo Cælorum, colam, honorabo, alam & regam te.*

6. The ſecond thing, fit to be premiſed, is this. If Heinſius mean onely, that there are divers words, phraſes, and ſentences in the Greek Teſtament, which never were coyned, ſtamped, or allowed in Athens, as free-denizons of Greece; but are borrowed, and tranſlated from the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriack; no man will oppoſe him, and the exemplifying of it were eaſie and delightfull, if I had not made too large excurſions before, in a matter not much differing from this: But when he ſaith, They who were Jews by birth or generation, and withall did both know and ſpeak Greek, may be called *Helleniſts*; and that theſe Helleniſts, writing in Greek, much differed in language from the Heathen Grecians: As I deny it not in the generall; ſo ſome Jews there were, who, being wonderouſly well verſed in the Greek, wrote in Greek moſt politely: whence Philo Judæus was ſaid to Platonize; and Joſephus is ſtyled by Baronius, *The Greek Livius.*

Thirdly,

Thirdly, if Heinſius had onely ſaid, that S. John ſaw the Helleniſts; that S. John might have ſeen the paraphraſe of Onkelos; that the Chaldee Metaphraſe *Sanctiſsimo Joanni plurimis in locis placuit*; that S. John *ad Chaldaicam ſæpe alluſit interpretationem; quâ Judæi Aſiatici, ut olim, ità nunc utuntur*; all which he ſaith pag. 61. I would onely have wiſhed to ſee his proofs.

Fourthly, if Heinſius mean, that the Helleniſts onely, who were not inſpired from God, conceived in one tongue, what they did write; and wrote in another, what they conceived; I will ſubſcribe; and adde, that whatſoever they did ſpeak in Greek, they firſt had the notions of it in Syriack; and thence did, as it were, tranſlate their ſpeech, or writings; even (perhaps) Philo, and Joſephus, and ſuch as trafficked much with Greece, and Greeks: unleſſe among the Jews there might be ſuch a caſe, as was of Lord Michael de Mountaigne, who (as himſelf relateth in his Eſſaies, 1. 25.) being born a French man, yet never heard French, till he was above ſix yeares old; nor underſtood any word of his mother-tongue, no more then he did Arabick; becauſe he was brought up, where he heard no other language ſpoken, then Latine onely: and therefore long after, when he uſually ſpake nothing, but his Perigordin or French; yet upon great ſudden exigents, his conceits were firſt ſhaped in Latine; and his words brake forth, ere he was aware, in Latine, and not in French, as himſelf recordeth. So ſay I, if a Jew were thus brought up in the Greek, or in any other languages, his conceits might be the apprehenſions of his childiſh language, and not of that tongue which he uſed after.

Fifthly, and laſtly, if becauſe Heinſius himſelf is a daintie Critick, he will reduce the judgement of all Divinitie to Scriptures, of all Scriptures to Criticiſme; I will not contradict it, if we confine this judiciarie Cenſorſhip and Criticiſme to men skilfull and eminent in all arts, ſciences, and languages: for who can ſo well interpret Scripture, as ſuch men? It was a paſſionate conceit of hood-winkt men, as is recorded in the hiſtorie of the councel of Trent, lib. 2. pag. 122. [s] *When each man hath power to inquire into the tranſlation of the Scripture whether it be good or no; either comparing it with other interpreters, or conſulting with the Hebrew Text: then theſe new-ſprung pettie-Grammarians would make a confuſion of all things, and arrogate to themſelves alone the judgement and reſolutions in matters of faith.* And pag. 125. Almoſt all allowed the vulgar Edition, [t] *This made a powerfull impreſſion upon the mindes of the Prelates: becauſe it was ſaid Grammarians would aſſume to themſelves authoritie to direct and inſtruct Biſhops and Divines.* Wiſely, wiſely, as if Divines and Biſhops ought not to have been perfect Grammarians before they were Divines: As if both could not conſiſt together: As if famous and deep Divines had not been admirable, yea, the

[s] *Poteſtate unicuique factâ in Scripturæ verſionem inquirendi, utrum proba ſit, nè cui vel cum aliis interpretibus eam comparando, vel contextu Hebræo conſulto: tum novos hoſce Grammaticaſtros omnia interturbaturos, & ſibi ſolis judicium & arbitrium in rebus fidei arrogaturos.*

[t] *In præſulum animos vehementi indè impreſſione factâ, quòd dicebatur, Grammaticos Epiſcoporum ac Theologorum inſtituendorum poteſtatem ſibi arrogaturos.*

the beſt and ſoundeſt of all Linguiſts and Criticks; whom they ſcornfully term pettie Grammarians: As if they envied any men theſe paſſages of learning, which they kenned not; and would put out the candle, which other men lighted; delighting rather in darkneſſe, then ſuffering ſome places, uſed by Popes and School-men, to be queſtioned and cleared: and it was a juſt indignation of the Friars againſt the Fathers, in the councel of Trent, becauſe they were ſo prompt to define Articles, and pronounce Anathemaes, when they did not well underſtand, and were loth to be taught the things themſelves, as it is in the Hiſtorie of the councel of Trent, lib. 6. pag. 481.

But ſince he ſaith of the Evangeliſt S. John, [x] *He alwaies had an eye to the Targumiſts*, pag. 289. and, [y] *He ſtill reſpecteth the Targumiſts*, pag. 250. and, [z] *All the words and ſpeech ſoundeth ſtrange*, pag. 230. as if there were not in S. Joh. one line, or phraſe, of pure good heathen Greek. Since he maketh the Helleniſticall Greek & the other Greek, divers languages, pag. 373. though they differ not ſo much as ſome Dialects, (beſides his jerk at Nonnus for his Grecanick, rather then Greek) adding to this effect, Prolegom. pag. 93. *Many have known ſuperficially the Helleniſticall tongue, but few the depth of it.* Since he reſteth not at this, ſaying, *It much matereth to know, whether an Helleniſt expreſſe the Hebrew, or the Syriack in Greek; and whether he hath an eye to the Hebrew Text, or to the interpretations of the Grecians*; but addeth, [a] *All which unleſſe the Interpreter diſtinguiſh, he muſt needs loſe his labour.* And *he hath little knowledge, and no conſcience* (as Heinſius cenſureth) [b] *who dares tranſlate the Scripture, and thought not on theſe things*, Pag. 53. *Prolegom.* Whereby all the Primitive-Church, the Schoolmen, and late Writers, Interpreters or Tranſlatours, who knew not Hebrew from Syriack, are cenſured as unconſcionable ignorants. Since he proceedeth, avouching, *The knowledge of the New Teſtament* [c] *in vain ſhall you ſeek from the Grecians, becauſe both words and phraſes winde up to the Hebrew or Syriack.* And again, *The Greek Fathers* [d] *amazing the world with their abundant learning, have given document, that other things without the Hebrew are little worth:* Whence may be inferred, that the knowledge of the Greek in the New Teſtament is not to be found in the Greek Fathers, and that their labours have been of little worth: though ſome Greek Fathers knew the Eaſtern tongues better then Heinſius; as Origen, Theodoret, and others; and the moſt learned of them all in thoſe Eaſtern languages, to wit, Origen, was the worſt of them all in the interpretation of Scriptures. Since he proclaimeth in his *Prolegomena, Cùm plurima in novo fœdere à ſummis maximíſque hominibus ſunt præſtita, potiſſima pars ſupereſſe videtur*: Which is as much as if he had ſaid, All the world have not expounded the Greek Teſtament half well enough: or, not half of it well enough to this day: or,

[x] *Perpetuò ad Targumiſtas reſpexit.*
[y] *Ad Targumiſtas ſemper reſpicit.*
[z] *Totum λεξιλιχὸν, quod voces & ſermonem ſpectat, peregrinum eſt.*
[a] *Quæ niſi omnia diſtinguat, operam neceſſe eſt interpres ludat.*
[b] *Qui tranſferre ſacra audet, & de his non cogitavit.*
[c] *Fruſtra petas ex Græcis, quia ad Hebræam aut Syriacam & dictio & voces exigendæ ſunt.*
[d] *Omni eruditione ad ſtuporem omnium inſtructi.*

or, the choiceſt, learnedeſt men have laboured much; but the beſt or chiefeſt things have they not cleared: as if they who well interpreted Hebrew with her Dialects in the Old Teſtament, had been faultie in their interpretations of the New Teſtament, becauſe they underſtood not, or reflected not up to the ſame Hebrew and her Dialects.

I ſay, in all theſe regards we muſt ſever from Heinſius; and leaving him to his ſingularitie, hold our ſelves to the generall expoſitions which Fathers, Councels, and the Church of God hath made of Scripture; till this more then *Doctor ſubtilis*, or *Doctor Seraphicus* (for they are by him rejected, as being wholly ignorant of the Hebrew, Syriack, or Helleniſtick Greek) give us better and more light. All which things I paſſe by with a touch onely, becauſe he hath one ſtrain of farre more both difficultie and moment. In which one point many are involved, and ſome of thoſe ſeldome or never handled.

His words are theſe in his *Prolegomena*, pag. 52. [e] *If one ask of me, In what language S. John wrote; I will ſay, He wrote as an Helleniſt: If one enquire in what language he conceived the things which he wrote; I will ſay, He conceived them in the Syriack tongue, and that he did bend the Greek, and winde up to the Syriack both the words and the ſayings, as is proper to the Helleniſts. Wherefore we muſt not have recourſe to the alluſions which now are, but we muſt look to them which S. John then conceived in his minde.* Yea, *Proleg. pag.* 49. he ſaith in generall, [f] *The Penmen of the New Teſtament conceived in one language what they wrote, and wrote in another what they conceived.* So he.

Such is the power and vertue of naked truth, that if we could ſee her as ſhe is in her ſelf, *Admirabiles ſui amores excitaret, She would make men wonderfully enamoured on her:* and ſuch is the ouglineſſe of errour and untruth, that they dare not appeare without masks, vizors, colours, fucuſſes; but go commonly trooping in the companie of truth or likelihoods. And ſo it fareth in theſe words of Heinſius; in which there are ſome truths mingled and ſhuffled together with ſome errours; which will eaſier be diſtinguiſhed by their ſeverall ranks and files, if we conſider and handle three *Lemmata*, or *Poſtulata*, *Reaſonable axioms* or *demands*, which I account as granted: ſeven Queſtions and five Concluſions directly oppoſing Heinſius.

7. The firſt *Poſtulatum* is this, That the inſpirations and conceptions of the ſacred Penmen, were divinely delivered under one or other language.

S. Baſil in Pſal. 28. ſaid remarkably, that *the intellectuall and inward conceits of the inſpired were after a wonderfull manner, as it were, figured and characterized.* S. Auguſtine, *de Geneſ. ad literam*, 12. 26. ſaith thus of the kinde of propheſying by ſpirituall viſion: [g] *If the ſoul be rapted from and above the*

[e] *Si quis ex me quærat, Quanam linguâ ſcripſerit Evangeliſta noſter S. Joannes; Helleniſticâ ſcripſiſſe dicam: Si quis quâ conceperit, quæ ſcripſit; Syriacam fuiſſe dicam: Ad eam autem, quod eſt Helleniſtis proprium, & voces & ſermonē deflexiſſe Græcum. Quare ad alluſiones, non quæ extant, ſed quas animo conceperat, eundum eſt.*

[f] *Novi fœderis Scriptores linguâ conceperunt aliâ, quæ ſcriberent; aliâ ſcripſerunt, quæ conceperant.*

[g] *Si ab ipſa ſimilitudinibus rapiatur, ut in*

illam quasi regionem intellectualium & intelligibilium subvehatur, ubi sine ulla similitudine perspicua veritas cernitur, nullis opinionum falsarum nebulis obfuscatur; ibi virtutes animæ non sunt operosæ: ibi videtur claritas Domini, non per visionem significantem, sive corporalem, ut visa est in monte Sina, sive spiritualem, ut vidit Isaias, & Joannes in Apocalypsi; sed per speciem, non per ænigmata; quantum ea capere mens humana potest, secundum assumentis Dei gratiam, ut os ad os loquatur ei, quem dignum tali Deus colloquio fecerit; non os corporis, sed os mentis.

h Impossibile est aliter nobis lucere divinum radium, nisi varietate sacrorum velaminum circumvelatum.

i Omnes divinæ illuminationes perferuntur ad homines mediantibus Angelis.

k In hoc mundo visibili nihil, nisi per creaturam invisibilem, disponi potest.

l Arbitror Prophetas nequaquam percepisse Verbum Dei sensili auditu, per conformationem aëris: sed quando animæ intellectu præditæ, suæ suppetunt aures, quæ à supernis nuntiabantur, citra ullam corporis vocem, ad eorum pertingebant notitiam.

m Sine sonis sermonum & elementis literarum, eò dulcius, quo secretius, veritas loquitur.

the phantasmes, so that it is elevated and carried, as it were, into that region of things intellectuall and intelligible, where without any phantasme or similitude apparent truth is seen, no clouds of opinion dimming it; there the faculties and powers of the soul are not turmoiled or painfully busied: there the brightnesse or excellencie of the Lord is seen, not by any typicall or corporall vision, as it was seen in mount Sina; or spirituall, as Isaiah saw, and S. John in the Revelation: but plainly and directly, not darkly or in riddles, so farre as the minde of man can conceive, according to the grace of the indulgent Lord, so lifting up the soul, that he speaks face to face to him whom the Lord makes worthy of such a conference: Understand the face or mouth, not of the body, but of the minde.

Dionysius, *cœlestis Hierarch. cap.* 1. somewhat otherwise: [h] *It is impossible that the divine light should otherwise shine upon us, then clouded and surrounded with varietie of sacred vails and coverings.* For humane understanding cannot conceive the very bare and naked intelligible truth her self, without conversion to the *Phantasmata*; therefore things propounded to men by God or Angels, are propounded under sensible similitudes, and resemblances not meerly incorporeall: I say, *by God, or Angels*; for howsoever Dionysius *cap.* 4. *de divinis nominibus, part.* 1. *aliquantulum ante medium,* saith, [i] *All divine irradiations are brought unto men by the interposition or help of Angels:* and Gregorie, *Dialog.* 4, 5. [k] *In this visible world nothing can be ordered, but by the invisible creature:* yet I would be loath peremptorily to exclude Gods immediate operation or illumination; but rather conclude, That all intellectuall irradiation of men, either by God immediately, or by Angels, is by known *species.*

Basil on Isa. 7. 3. [l] *I think that the Prophets received not the word of God by sensible hearing, by the corresponding help and conformation of the aire: but since the intellective soul hath its proper kinde of eares or hearing, what was spoken from above and from God, came to their knowledge and notice without any bodily voice.* See Aquin. *part.* 1. *quæst.* 210. *art.* 1.

In all three kindes of oracles, by which God speaketh to men (the Externall, the Imaginarie-spirituall, the Spirituall-intellectuall) there are some *species* or other intercurrent between God inspiring and inlightning, and man apprehending or conceiving. Though where Fulgentius saith truly, that in divine inspiration, [m] *Without the sound of words or elements of letters, the truth speaketh so much the sweeter, by how much the secreter,* is rightly inferred; that there is no outward sound; yet there is an intellectuall *loquitur* of the Spirit to our inward man; and it attempereth and mouldeth it self to the capacitie, abilitie, and habituall *species* of the part recipient, that is, our understanding; or frameth our understanding to it.

Men

Men may be taught new languages on a ſudden, and underſtand as ſuddenly things before unknown; but to conceive without ſome kinde of word, is above conceit. God himſelf cannot be conceived by men, but by ſimilitudes of things corporeall; and, perhaps, even Angels cannot conceive of him but under ſome ſhadow: for a finite thing cannot comprehend an infinite eſſence, but onely according to its model. An infinite thing onely can comprehend infinitie as it is in it ſelf.

When the Spirit of God immediately ſpeaketh to the ſpirits of men, though the irradiation be ſpirituall and intellectuall, yet it is ſhaped to the habits of knowledge acquired. Infuſed notions muſt be proportionable to acquired, actuall, to habituall; all homogeneall, not heterogeneall; having affinitie, and holding correſpondent intelligence with the *ſpecies* received. [n] *Whatſoever is received, is received according to the meaſure, power, or facultie of the receiver,* is a true ground, and ſound maxime, as well in Divinitie as in Philoſophie.

[n] *Quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis.*

There is not an higher illumination then was that of S. Paul: yet was there in him, and in all others, ſomewhat *loco ſigni & vocis, in the room or ſtead of the ſigne, voice, or ſpecies.* 2. Cor. 12.4. *I heard unſpeakable words,* (yet words ſpoken) *which it was not lawfull* (or poſſible) *for a man to utter:* yet to him they were uttered; and it is not certain that he was bodily rapt into the third heaven.

Auguſtine, *de Geneſ. ad liter.* 12.27. diſcourſing of Gods ſpeaking to Moſes, Numb. 12.8. *Os ad os loquar ad illum, in ſpecie, & non per ænigmata; I will ſpeak to him face to face, apparently and plainly, not by riddles or obſcurities,* ſaith, *This is not to be underſtood according to the bodily ſubſtance preſented to the eyes of the fleſh; for ſo he ſpake to Moſes face to face, when Moſes ſaid, Oſtende mihi temetipſum, Shew me thy ſelf:* and addeth, [o] *But in that way, and in that form as he is God, he ſpeaketh ineffably, more ſecretly, more home and cloſe to the purpoſe, more nearely preſent with words unſpeakable.* And in the Chapter following he ſaith, *The ſpeaking mouth to mouth was* [p] *by ſuch a ſpecies, by which God is whatſoever is: howſoever the minde of man which is not as God, cannot conceive him without bodie or bodily ſimilitude:* where ſtill he maketh a kinde of not-ſpeaking ſpeech, or of ſpeaking non-ſpeech, according to the capacitie of man.

[o] *Illo ergò modo, in illa ſpecie quâ Deus eſt, longè ineffabiliter ſecretius & præſentius loquitur locutione ineffabili.*

[p] *Per ſpeciem ſcilicet, quâ eſt Deus quicquid eſt: quantulumcunque eum mens, quæ non eſt quod ipſe, &c.*

The ſecond *Lemma* is this, That the holy Actuaries, or Writers of the Divine Scripture, could not erre in their conceptions.

Auguſtine, *de Geneſ. ad liter.* 12.25. proveth daintily in generall, that our outward and inward ſenſes may be deceived; when onely the intellectuall viſion is certain, and is not deceived: [q] *Either it underſtandeth, and then it is true; or if it be not true,*

[q] *Aut enim intelligit, & verum eſt; aut, ſi non eſt verum, non intelligit.*

true, it underſtandeth not. As the aire is enlightened by the reſplendent rayes of the ſunne, ſo was their intellect by ſupernall, bright, unfailing irradiation; which beam of divine light wrought theſe two effects: Firſt, that they knew certainly it was God who ſpake unto them: Secondly, that they could not miſconceive or take awry in an erring ſenſe the things inſpired: which illumination may be called *Guſtus Dei, The taſte of God*, Pſal. 34. 8. *The wheels with ſtrakes full of eyes round about them*, Ezek. 1. 18. *Cloven tongues like as of fire*, Act. 2. 3. *As it were,* a ſixth ſenſe leading to knowledge*, as Clemens *Recognit. lib.* 2. termeth it: *A joyfull ſound, the light of Gods countenance*, Pſal. 89. 15. *In thy light we ſhall ſee light*, Pſal. 36. 9. *A burning and a ſhining light*, Joh. 5. 35. *A marvellous light*, 1. Pet. 2. 9. *Sol ſpiritualis, An intellectuall ſunne: Sapor, a ſavour or taſte; which Monica could not expreſſe by words*, as her ſonne relateth, *Confeſſ.* 6. 13. *Intimus ſapor*, ſaith Gregorie, *Dialog.* 4. 4. *Intimus ſapor & experimentalis illuminatio, A moſt inward reliſh, and experimentall illumination*, as Gerſon ſtyleth it: *Columna ignis, A pillar of fire*, Exod. 13. 21. *Stella Magos in Oriente antecedens; The ſtarre conducting the wiſe men of the Eaſt*, Matth. 2. 9. *An holy, undeceiving, unambiguous influent coruſcation: The Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters*, Gen. 1. 2. This made Abraham not unwillingly to ſacrifice his ſonne. The quenching of this Spirit againſt the cleare light of his own convicted conſcience, made the old Prophet more inexcuſable then the other officious lying Prophet, who deceived him, 1. Kings 13. 16, &c. Nor did an Angel ſpeak unto the ſeducer by the word of the Lord, verſ. 18. Samuel being but a childe might not indeed, as a novice; or ſome others, for a while, might not know the voice of the Lord: as Peter at the preſent knew not the operation of God by the Angel, in his miraculous deliverie: *But now I know* (ſaith he) *that God hath ſent his Angel*; yea, *I know of a ſurety*, Act. 12. 11.

* *Sextus ſenſus præno-ſcendi.*

Profane ones I will not priviledge from miſtaking of God: as perhaps, leſt Satan might out-ſtretch his Commiſsion from God, when he gave Job into his hands, God ſaid reſtrainingly, *Onely ſave his life*, Job 2. 6. And S. Auguſtine, *de cura pro mortuis gerenda, cap.* 12. telleth an admirable ſtorie of two men, each called *Curma*; to wit, How Curma the Countrey-man lay almoſt dead many dayes: onely, a little ſteam of breath coming from him, they kept him from buriall, though he was without motion, or any feeling, whatſoever they did unto him; in which time he ſaw many viſions: So ſoon as he opened his eyes, he ſaid, *Let one go to the houſe of Curma the ſmith.* Who was found dead that moment in which Curma the Husbandman came to his ſenſes. And the ſurviving Curma related, that he heard in the place from whence he was returned, that the

the ſmith, and not himſelf, was to be brought to that place. A miſtaking there was by the meſſengers of death, though it were after righted. Caiaphas might not know the inſpiration or inſtinct propheticall which he had, becauſe he was a wicked man: *Diſpenſativè illi contigit ſermo, He did diſtribute the ſpeech to others, which he knew not himſelf*, ſaith Baſil *in Proœm. Iſaiæ.* He was a Prophet *perchance, Caſu*, ſaith Origen on John. Balaam his aſſe and Caiaphas ſpake they knew not what. *The propheſie was tranſitorie*, ſaith S. Auguſtine. Wherefore I conclude, as before, That wicked men may be puniſhed with miſtakings in things divine. But that ever any holy man was ignorant to the end, that God moved when he moved him; or that the righteous were ever deceived by Oraculous, anfractuous perplexities; or that the Notaries of heaven, the writers of any part authentick of either Teſtament, could be deceived in their conceptions, is not agreeable to likelihood, reaſon, or truth.

The laſt *Lemma* is this, The holy Penmen could not erre in writing.

If they could, what difference is there between their Writings, and other profane Authours?

And to what end had they infallibilitie of underſtanding, if what they underſtood they could expreſſe erroneouſly?

A readie, perfect, and quick ſcribe writeth not falſly; but, *My tongue is the pen of a readie writer*, ſaith the Pſalmographe, Pſal. 45. 1. Holy Ezra, who was the divine *Amanuenſis* of the book of Ezra, is called by the ſame words, SOPHER MAHIR, *a readie, ſwift, exact ſcribe*, Ezra 7. 6. no queſtion, with alluſion to the words of the Pſalmiſt.

John 16. 13. *When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.* How into all truth, if there be an errour in writing? Or, had God care that the Apoſtles ſhould not miſſe of the truth in their Speeches, and yet miſſe in their Writings?

If the Prophets could not erre, no more could the Evangeliſts or Apoſtles: for, if there were any ſuperioritie in priviledge, we are rather to aſcribe it to theſe latter, then to thoſe former; in regard that the Law of Chriſt and of Grace, is farre above the Law of Moſes, as the Apoſtle doth demonſtrate to the Hebrews themſelves. But that the Prophets could not erre is apparent, becauſe Chriſt himſelf, who is Truth, would not have appealed from the preſent more viſible pretending Synagogue, to them as all-ſufficient Judges (as he often did) if they could erre. A perfect rule is not to be tried by an imperfect one. Prophets writ their Propheſies, and faſtened them to the gates of the Temple, and other publick places, to be read: and were rather judged by their Propheſies written, then by them as inſpired or uttered by mouth.

The *Gnomon* of the Sunne-diall, which our late Hieroglyphical Poetaster doth make to signifie the Scriptures, is better to be judged by a moving clock, the curious handie-work of the same great Artist (I mean, by the Church, and Churchmen, with whom Christ hath promised his Spirit shall be to the end of the world) then by the rude masons, or rather the senseleſſe stones and mortar of the walls, (I mean the ignorant people) who have plucked down not onely the Weather-cock (by his interpretation, the Pope) but usurp to themselves a power to judge the *Gnomon*, and to reform and amend the well wrought, well ordered clock. The shallow phantastick stateth not the question aright, when he is so magisterially peremptorie, saying, *That the Clergie may not so judge of the Scriptures, as to conclude or teach any thing against them; or to vouch unwritten verities* (if they be certain verities, it matter-eth not much whether they be written or unwritten: Veritie will vouch it self in spight of lying Poets) *as some call them, or Traditions contradictorie to the written Word:* Which contradictorie Traditions do much differ from unwritten Verities, howsoever the Poet confusedly joyneth them. For, who of us ever taught that the Clergie may teach any thing against the Scriptures? when we professe with him, that the Church ought to subject it self to be directed by the Scriptures. But that fabling rymer may say any thing, who in his *Sarcasmos* and Frontispice is suffered thus to rave,

No wonder that the Clergie would be Kings:

whereas we the now unpriviledged Clergie, do humbly pray to God to uphold our declining estates from the hands of those Atheists, and turbulent Anti-episcopall, Anti-monarchicall Reformists; perhaps Pensioners of the forein enemies of our State, who, under the pretence of Religion, labour to pluck down our Church and Ecclesiastick Hierarchie; and upon the ruines thereof to arise to the depluming of the Eagle; to the bearding of the Lion; not onely to the paring of the royall prerogative, but also the removing the very scepter and crown from the Anointed of the Lord, (whom God alwaies mightily defend!) and to the bringing in of popular government: for, *No Bishop, no King*, said the learned, wise, and pious King James, most truely.

I return to retort the Church-reforming Poets words upon himself: In his Solarie he saith, That the diall is the Written Word, which is of it self dead and unprofitable, without further illumination; since none of the Philosophers, nor Solomon himself, by the meer strength of Nature, could from thence draw saving knowledge without saving grace. The question is not, Whether the Scripture or Church shall be Judge; but, Whether the Clergie or Laitie shall be Interpreters

ters of this dead word, and unprofitable without further illumination. We bid not the people to pluck out their eies, that they may be led by us, as the Jesuites and Popish Priests do; neither do we like the other extream of the people, presuming that they can give better answer then the Ephod, the Urim and the Thummim, and over-see the Seers, who ought (by the expresse commandment of God himself) to have the oversight of them, Heb. 13. 7. But they are to rest contented with the generall Commission given to the Ministerie, *He that heareth you, heareth me*; especially in things (as most things are) above their capacitie. But the people will expound Scriptures, contradict their Pastours, censure their labours, judge their Judges, even in matters of such speculation as they may most safely be ignorant of; and, under pretence of desire to have their consciences well informed, will not be informed at all in any thing against their humours and fancie; but monopolize the Spirit to themselves, and yeeld no more in this point to the ordinance of God, who hath committed to us the word of reconciliation, then to the very devils, whom they are bound to beleeve and follow, in all things wherein their consciences are well informed.

My former task recalleth me. Bezaleel and Aholiab both did and could work all manner of work for the service of the Sanctuarie, *according to all that the Lord had commanded*, Exod. 36. 1. Had God more care of his Sanctuarie, then of the Church of Christ? Or could God command an untruth, when he guided the Apostles and Evangelists as powerfully, if not more then ever he did the workmen of his Sanctuarie? Or had the Penmen lesse grace or goodnesse then the workmen? Certainly they had, if they swarved in writing from what was commanded by God. Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make the Tabernacle; *See* (saith God) *that thou makest all things according to the pattern shewed thee in the mount*, Hebr. 8. 5. which the Apostle borrowed from Exod. 25. 8, &c. where God giveth this charge, *Let them make me a Sanctuarie —according to all that I shew thee, after the pattern of the Tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it.* So, and no otherwise; not so much as a little nail or peg shall make any difference. And shall we think, that the Evangelists and Apostles might swarve in writing from what was delivered unto them?

That Christ himself could and did teade, is proved Luk. 4. 16. That he could and did write is plain, John 8. 6, &c. That he ever wrote any part of his doctrine, of the Law of Grace, of our Scripture, is not evident: for though Baronius, *ad annum Christi* 31. saith, That many of the Ancients beleeved that our blessed Saviour wrote an epistle unto Abagarus, or Abgarus,

Prince of Edessa; yet since Salianus wholly balketh this storie, (which he would not have done, if there had been either truth or likelihood in the matter; because of the miracles mentioned by Baronius, wrought by the image of our Saviours face, which himself sent to the same Prince) let us esteem it as a thing unworthy of belief. That whatsoever Christ did, he did both well and conveniently, and whatsoever he omitted, he also omitted well and conveniently, I take for most certain: and yet, if he had done something which he omitted, I dare say he had also done well and conveniently: and I should be afraid to say, That it was not convenient for Christ to write any part of Scripture therefore, because personally he wrote none. *It was convenient for others, and not for Christ himself, to write his own doctrine* (saith Aquin. 3. *part. quæst.* 42. *art.* 4.) *for the excellencie both of the Teacher, and of the doctrine*; which he confirmeth thus, *The most excellent way was, to imprint his doctrine in their hearts: So did Christ teach,* As Having Power, *Matth.* 7. 29. *and Pythagoras and Socrates, the excellentest teachers among the Gentiles, would write nothing. For the Scripture is ordained to imprint doctrine in the hearts, as to an end. Moreover, if Christ had written his own doctrine, men would never have had an higher esteem of his doctrine, then of that which might arise from things contained in Scripture.* Those are the words of Aquin. Much of this is but meer froth, and the shadow of reason, unfitting the pen of so Angelicall a Doctour, who remembred not that God himself wrote the Law; and that God did write the Law in some mens hearts, as well as in stone, Hebr. 8. 10. and so might Christ in both, if he had pleased. As for Pythagoras and Socrates, if they wrote nothing, yet their words made no deeper impression upon the hearts of their auditours, then the writings of many other men have done upon the hearts of their readers. Moreover, some have thought that Pythagoras and Socrates were not the excellentest teachers among the Gentiles; Aristotle and Plato are esteemed their equals; and some have preferred Hermes Trismegistus and Homer before both of them. Indeed the Scripture was ordained to imprint doctrine in the heart; was it therefore inconvenient that Christ himself should write? His speech was ordained to imprint his doctrine in their hearts, as to an end, yet was not his speech inconvenient: no more inconvenient had been his writing; yea rather more convenient (if so it had pleased him) because many of his words reached but to a few; but his writings might have reached to many millions of places and persons more, and might have been everlasting. To conclude, If the Jews looked through the vails, types, and shadows of Moses Law, to the more spirituall things of Christ; then certainly, if Christ had writ

q *Nihil altius de ejus doctrina homines æstimarent, quàm quod Scriptura contineret.*

writ his doctrine, we would not esteem of him according to the letter onely of that doctrine; but we would think (as we ought) that either he wrote not all, or wrote onely such things as were fit for us to know, or as we could understand; reserving more secret, deep, and divine things to himself. For reasons best known to himself, he baptized not any, no not his own Apostles. For reasons best known to himself, he wrote not immediately any part of Scripture. To say it was not convenient because Christ did it not, inferreth that Christ was bound to do all things convenient; yea, and which man judgeth convenient, and what he did not do was not convenient.

God might have bettered, and may yet better some of his own works, though they be very good: Shall we conclude, that because he did not, therefore it was not fit he should have done so? God did not say at the end of the second dayes work particularly and expressely, *It was good*, or *God saw that it was good*; as he did at all and every of the other five dayes creation: Was it therefore not good? Yes verily; for Gen. 1. 31. *God saw every thing that he had made, and behold, it was very good.*

John 14. 16, &c. *The Comforter shall abide with you for ever: even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him: for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.* And verse 26. *The Comforter shall teach you all things*: Therefore he shall teach them to write truely: the Spirit of truth will not suffer them to write falsly whilest he dwelleth with them, and in them; as he did when they wrote.

Inspiration was ordained as a cause, and as a means of right conceiving: conceiving or apprehension was appointed as a cause and a means of right expression: expression was either by word or writing. Many words were prophetically and most divinely spoken, which were not written; not so many were written, as were first spoken: The vocall expression was more transient and transitorie; perhaps, concerning some few, and those onely of those times: the expression permanent, and by writing, was and is directorie to mankinde to the end of the world. Inspiration, apprehension, and much expression by voice, were all as means to this main end, that there might be a Scripture. Shall the means be certain, unerring, and inerrable; and shall the end be dubious, crooked and erring? The perfect use of the right means leads on infallibly to an undeceiving and exact end: If the Divine Penmen could not erre or be misled in the former, which sometimes vanished, leaving no footsteps behinde them; it is not possible that they should erre in writing, which is the master-